SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

Rev. John C. Mayne, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, in this hour we would pray for Thy loving kindness and tender mercy upon this our Nation, and upon the leaders here assembled on this day.

We are conscious of the awesome burdens upon the Chief Executive of our land, and the heavy decisions which rest upon those who make our laws, and the dangers which beset those who protect our Nation. We are thankful that Thy protecting arms have been around the President of this Senate in his journey of understanding and reconciliation.

O God, it is our fervent prayer that—through the fog of confusion we may see a pathway made straight; amidst the clouds of conflict we may view the sunlight of peace.

Great Father of mankind, in Thy wisdom Thou gavest Thy Son to teach us how to live in peace and love.

O Lord and Master, suffer us never to be complacent in the face of wrong; stab our conscience as long as little children starve in our slums or aging peasants suffer in the burning jungles of the East. And may that ancient freedom to voice concern for our America never cease. May discord of debate and confrontation never destroy the unity of purpose nor sever the strong cords which bind us together as brothers in this blessed Nation.

And now, stir our hearts with harmonies of majestic song—

> "Long may our land be bright, With freedom's holy light Protect us by Thy might, Great God our King."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 23, 1966, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DUR-ING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Aeronautical and Space

Sciences be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, for purposes of discussion, I should like to suggest a unanimous-consent request, that on Friday, debate on each amendment be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided between the sponsor of the amendment and the acting majority leader; and, further, that debate on the bill be limited to 4 hours, 2 hours on each side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, February 24, 1966, the Vice President had signed the enrolled bill (S. 1904) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the pueblos of Acoma, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REFORT ON LIQUIDATION OF STOCKS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES HELD BY COMM

CULTURAL COMMODITIES HELD BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRI-CULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSIST-ANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Seminole Nation, Docket No. 248 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development procurement actions of \$50,000 and over, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE III OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AMEND-MENTS OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission certain additional regulatory authority over communication common carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL APPARES

A letter from the Chairman, the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, entitled "Open Hearts Open Minds—How America Welcomes Foreign Visitors" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY RE-CEIVED BY STATE SURPLUS PROPERTY AGEN-CIES FOR DISTRIBUTION TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal and real property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF ACTING COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on potential savings through direct procurement of components used in production of variable timing fuses (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of approval of mortgage insurance on housing project for the elderly in Houston, Tex., Federal for the elderly in Houston, Tex., Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on pricing of recorders purchased from Midwestern Instruments, Inc., Tulsa, Okla., Department of the Air Force, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Gov-

ernment Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need to reexamine planned replacement and augmentation of high-endurance vessels, western area, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on information relating to local employment created by the accelerated public works program, Area Development Administration, Department of Commerce, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on

Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on actions being taken to achieve greater utilization of limited-life and long-supply items in civil defense medical stockpile managed by Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of cost-sharing arrangements with the State of Oregon for the operations of fish hatcheries, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government

Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inclusion of balconies and use of high-cost brick in constructing low-rent public housing projects, Public Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on allocation of school facility costs to five federally assisted urban renewal projects in New Jersey and Illinois. Urban Renewal Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying re-port); to the Committee on Government

Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need to strengthen supervision over city delivery carriers, Post Office Department, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need to consider storing processed commodities on a daily-rate basis, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the approval of mortgage insurance for a housing project for the elderly located near Fort Worth, Tex., Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on audit of Farm Credit Administration, fiscal year 1965, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Op-

erations.

REPORT ON EXTENSION OF CERTAIN CONCESSION CONTRACTS AND PERMITS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the extension of certain concession contracts and permits (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON PETITIONS GRANTING THIRD AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION TO CER-TAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COST ASCERTAINMENT REPORT, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cost ascertainment report of that Department, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

> By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22

"Concurrent resolution relative to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the presidency and vice-presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"Whereas at the 1st Session of the 89th Congress of the United States, begun and held at the city of Washington on Wednesday, the 4th day of January 1965, it was resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), that the following article be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the said Constitution, viz:

" 'ARTICLE -

"'SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become Pres-

"'SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'SEC. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"'SEC. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.': Therefore be it.

'Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 123d General Assembly of the State of Delaware (the Senate concurring therein):

"Section 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby ratified by the General Assembly of the State of Delaware and shall be to all intents and purposes a part of the Constitution of the United

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and concurrent resolution shall be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

"SEC. 3. That the clerk of the house of representatives and the secretary of the senate be, and they are hereby directed, to deliver to the said Governor certified copies of this resolution at their earliest conven-

ience."

A resolution adopted by the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, favoring a careful reconsideration of the proposed site change of the manned orbital laboratory program from Cape Kennedy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the selection of that city as a demonstration city; to the Committee on Banking and Cur-

rency.

A resolution adopted by the Spokane Tribe of Indians, opposing any change in the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs; to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted at a convention of the diocese of Washington of the Episcopal Church, District of Columbia, relating to security under the law; to the Committee

on the Judiciary.

The petition of John F. Bradley, of Wilmington, Del., relating to the terms of President and Vice President and Congressmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., urging reconsideration of the proposal that a reduction be made in the appropriation for aid to impacted areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by Auke Bay Post No. 25, the American Legion, Auke Bay, Alaska, commending the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] for the service rendered by him to bring about the enactment of the socalled cold war GI bill of rights bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Parma, Ohio, expressing appreciation to Vice President HUMPHREY for his recent visit to that city; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 9883. An act to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1007).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment: H.R. 12563. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank (Rept. No. 1008).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2973. A bill to permit Edward C. Bower to serve as a director of the Virgin Islands National Bank prior to his obtaining U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on Banking

and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr.

KENNEDY of New York): S. 2974. A bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act so as to provide for more effective development and utilization of the Nation's manpower resources by expanding, modernizing, and improving operations under such act at both State and Federal levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a

separate heading.)
By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2975. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful certain actions designed to influence individuals to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr.

HRUSKA):

S. 2976. A bill to provide for the construction of wells and other facilities necessary to provide a supplemental water supply to the lands of the Mirage Flats Irrigation District, Mirage Flats project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: S. 2977. A bill to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development; and

S. 2978. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. DODD, and Mr. SALTON-STALL)

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN concerning above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

MANPOWER SERVICES ACT OF 1966

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] and myself. I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act so as to provide for more effective development and utilization of the Nation's manpower resources by expanding, modernizing, and improving operations under such act at both State and Federal levels, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and ap-

propriately referred.

The bill (S. 2974) to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act so as to provide for more effective development and utilization of the Nation's manpower resources by expanding, modernizing, and improving operations under such act at both State and Federal levels, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of New York), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a primary goal of this Nation's economic and manpower policies is the full and efficient development and utilization of its manpower resources. During the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, our commitment to these goals has taken on new meaning. We have begun to experiment with the full utilization of monetary and fiscal policies which are essential for the rapid economic growth necessary to achieve and maintain full employment. In addition, we have complemented this monetary and fiscal policy with legislation designed to promote an active and aggressive manpower policy. The results of these efforts are everywhere apparent-unemployment which was 6.7 percent in 1961 has fallen to 4 percent; gross national product which was \$520 billion in 1961 rose to \$675 billion in 1965.

The results are encouraging and the lessons are instructive, but our efforts represent only a beginning and we must go forward. This Nation cannot be satisfied while 32 million of her citizens remain in poverty, while Negro unemployment remains twice that of whites and teenage unemployment thrice that of others, and while countless millions have been deprived of the opportunity to realize their full potential.

Our continuing efforts to create full and efficient development and utilization of our human resources are dependent upon the implementation of our major legislation at the local community level. This implementation can be only as effective as the institutions which operate at this level.

One of these agencies is the Federal-State employment service. With its 2,000 local offices, the employment service reaches into the core of every city and rural area. It provides the facilities for those who seek assistance in choosing careers and finding new or better jobs.

The Employment Service has been given increased responsibilities in recent years. Already more than 20 pieces of major legislation are implemented, in whole or in part, by or through the Em-

ployment Service.

Much has happened in the more than three decades which have elapsed since the passage of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 which created the Employment Service. During this period, the Employment Service has been transformed from a labor exchange into our frontline agency for translating manpower policy and legislation into operational reality. It now provides comprehensive manpower services to all jobseekers.

These services include interviewing, testing, occupational counseling, referral for vocational education and on-the-job training, and job development and place-

ment.

These direct personal services, in turn, depend upon the collection, analysis, dissemination, and immediate availability of current labor market information.

Information must be available, not just for local job placement but for the matching of men and jobs across State lines and from one labor market to another.

There must also be information on employment trends, technological developments, and local, regional, and national economic changes.

Finally, the employment interviewer and counselor must have occupational guidance and career development information

To provide these services on a nationwide basis requires no less than a modern automatic data processing system joining every employment center throughout the country.

To fulfill its assigned mission, the Employment Service must have qualified, well-paid professional and administrative personnel at all levels. Minimum professional standards and salaries should be established for Employment Service personnel.

Mr. President, these are but a few of the requirements of a modern manpower

services agency.

The time has come to update the mandate of the Employment Service and to more clearly define its functions and responsibilities. The bill which I send to the desk contains this updated mandate and provides the Secretary of Labor with the tools necessary to transform the Employment Service into a manpower services agency which is so vitally needed if we are to continue to meet the human commitments of the Great Society.

serviceman in Vietnam, radio programs. recorded for use by a government that is killing Americans every day on the battlefields of southeast Asia, or a voice that attacks the very foundation stones of the community by inciting open lawbreaking certainly are matters beyond

The proposed measure is aimed at making such actions unlawful while at the same time upholding the constitutional freedom guaranteed individuals.

I sincerely trust that the committee to which this measure is referred will act promptly and favorably so that it can be enacted into law in this session of the Congress. It is, in my opinion, much needed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the proposed measure be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD

The bill (S. 2975) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful certain actions designed to influence individuals to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2975 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section

12 of the Universal Military Training and

Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 452),

is amended by inserting immediately before

tration or service in the armed forces, or

to refuse to comply with or evade any of the requirements of this title, or of any rule,

regulation, or direction issued pursuant to

this title, or who knowingly counsels, advises,

or urges any individual or individuals sub-

ject to the provisions of this title to refuse

or evade registration or service in the armed

forces, or to refuse to comply with or evade any of the requirements of this title, or any

rule, regulation, or direction issued pursuant

to this title, whether such counseling, ad-

vising, or urging is directed to a particular

individual or individuals or is directed to all

individuals, or any class or group thereof, subject to the provisions of this title,".

", or who conspires to commit any one or more of such offenses", the following: "or any person or persons who distribute or attempt to distribute any written or printed matter which counsels, advises or urges individuals subject to the provisions of this title to evade or refuse registration or service in the armed forces, or to refuse to comply with or evade any of the requirements of this title, or of any rule, regulation, or direction issued pursuant to this title, or who knowingly counsel, advise, or urge the parent, guardian, or wife of an individual subject to the provisions of this title to counsel, advise, or urge such individual to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces, or to refuse to comply with or evade any of the this title, or of any rule, requirements of regulation, or direction issued pursuant to this title, or who distribute or attempt to disformation. tribute any written or printed matter which counsels, advises, or urges the parent, guardian, or wife of any individual subject to the provisions of this title to counsel, advise, or urge such individual to refuse or evade regis-

Senator Kennepy of New York, has joined in sponsoring the Manpower Services Act of 1966 and that Representative ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, of the House Select Subcommittee on Labor is introducing identical legislation today the realm of free speech.

Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have scheduled joint hearings on the Manpower Services Act

The Holland subcommittee and the

Mr. President, I am pleased to note that

beginning March 7.

in the House.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO FUR-THER AMEND THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERV-ICE ACT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President. I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act in order to make unlawful certain actions by any person or persons designed to influence individuals to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces.

Briefly, the measure would prohibit such practices as calling upon students to ignore the directives of their local draft boards, as well as urging members of our Armed Forces in Vietnam to lay down their arms and come home.

It is also designed to outlaw harassing telephone calls to members of our Armed Forces and their families, as well as the activities of individuals like Ronald Ramsay, who by his own admission has been making tape recordings for Radio Hanoi exhorting American servicemen to cease carrying out their duties in South

Several measures have already been introduced, some of which are questionable from the standpoint of whether or not they violate legitimate discussions of the issues under the doctrine of free speech guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States. I believe that the proposed measure corrects these defects while at the same time permitting legitimate discussion of the issues.

This is a sincere effort to take care of the problem, while not stifling honest debate or legitimate discussions of issues that could produce constructive suggestions for the Nation's policymakers. It is solely designed to prohibit dangerous, seditious actions that undermine and subvert the effectiveness of our Armed Forces and threaten the very existence of the framework of law around which our society is constructed.

There are those among us who do not agree with the policies America is pursuing in Vietnam, and counsel against this Nation's participation in that conflict. But the vast majority of these individuals recognize that one can propose a policy and attempt to change it without subverting the best interests of this Nation.

The purpose of the measure, as I have previously stated, is designed solely to prevent activities on the part of any person or persons which go beyond legitimate discussion of the issues. Threatening telephone calls to the family of a PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO URBAN DEVELOPMENT

February 24, 1966

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills, one titled "The Urban Development and the other the "Housing and Urban Development Amendments of 1966." These are administration bills which the President has requested as part of his 1966 housing program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have each of these bills with a section-by-section summary thereof printed in the RECORD at the end of my

remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Church in the chair). Without objec-

tion, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the President's housing program is a most ambitious one and involves several new and different individual programs which have a great deal of merit and in fact may represent new milestones in our search for effective programs to meet national housing goals. However, the very nature of these new programs, involving as they do the coordination of a variety of Federal and local activities, will require a great deal of study and consideration and extensive perfecting language and amendments before they will be ready for approval by the Congress.

There are several provisions in these bills which I do not approve but nevertheless I feel that they desire full hearings and consideration of the Senate, and I am therefore introducing them as sub-

mitted by the administration.

The general purpose of the urban development bill is to promote good and effective metropolitan development and to make more efficient the myriad of government services, State, local, and Federal, now available to growing urban areas. This is indeed a most commendable purpose and I fully endorse proposals to meet such an objective.

One of the titles of this bill authorizing FHA insurance for financing the development of new communities and loans to land development agencies contains almost the same language which was proposed last year and which the Congress turned down for further study. I have not had time to review the new proposal in detail but I am willing to give the administration an opportunity to testify on the matter and to justify its requests, I assume based on new in-

The Senator from Pennsylvania will recall that we felt last year that it had not had sufficient study at that timethe "new town" proposal.

Mr. CLARK. I do indeed. I remember, however, that last year we passed probably the most effective and farreaching housing act in our history, certainly since I have been in the Senate, under the leadership of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator. I certainly agree with the Senator that it was a tremendous housing act. The Senator from Pennsylvania, who for many years served as a member of the Housing Subcommittee, helped things Another section of the bill would increase the authorization for mass transportation assistance and add further funds for research and development. This would be no more than a continuation of existing law to keep the program

going at present levels.

Another provision included in the bill would establish a new program of grants to States and metropolitan area agencies to help finance urban information cen-This provision has as its purpose ters. the development of more data and information on existing programs and activities related to solutions of urban problems, all of which are highly desirable. However, I believe that here again we need to know in more detail what the President has in mind and how such a program will fit in with existing data collecting and information distribution programs already operating. We will look forward to receiving the details in hearings to be scheduled later.

The second bill entitled "The Housing and Urban Development Amendments of 1966" is a typical bill on amendments to existing housing laws in order to improve and perfect existing FHA, urban renewal, and other urban development programs.

Mr. President, I had hoped after passage of the omnibus housing bill of 1965 that the Congress would not need to take any action on housing programs for some time. However, the President has come forward with new proposals which in their depth of comprehension and potential accomplishment could have an impact on housing and urban development as significant as some of the great housing acts of the past. It is clear to me that a program of this magnitude should not be adopted without full consideration and debate by Members of Congress and all concerned.

I plan full and extensive hearings on these bills and all other bills pending before the subcommittee including S. 2842, the "Demonstration Cities Act of 1966" introduced by Senator Douglas, and S. 2804 on mass transportation, introduced by Senator Williams of New Jersey, and, I may add, also a bill—introduced by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] relating to housing in Alaska, S. 1915.

The date for the hearings will be announced as soon as the schedule is set.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and section-by-section summaries will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Recorp, as follows:

S. 2977

A bill to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Urban Development Act".

TITLE I—GRANTS TO ASSIST IN PLANNED METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

Findings and declaration of purpose
SEC. 101. (a) The Congress hereby finds
that the welfare of the Nation and of its

people is directly dependent upon the effective organization and functioning of the metropolitan areas in which two-thirds of its people live and work.

It further finds that the continuing rapid growth of these areas makes it essential that they prepare, keep current, and actually carry out comprehensive plans and programs for their orderly physical development with a view to efficiently meeting all their economic and social needs.

It further finds that metropolitan areas are especially handicapped in this task by the complexity and scope of governmental services required in such rapidly growing areas, the multiplicity of political jurisdictions and agencies involved, and the inadequacy of the operational and administrative arrangements available for cooperation among them.

It further finds that present requirements for areawide planning and programming in connection with various Federal programs have materially assisted in the solution of metropolitan problems, but that additional participation and cooperation are needed from the States and localities in perfecting and carrying out such areawide efforts.

(b) It is the purpose of this title to provide additional encouragement and assistance to States and localities, through supplementary grants for certain Federally-assisted development projects, for making effective comprehensive metropolitan planning and programming.

Grant authority

Sec. 102. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make supplementary grants to applicant State and local public bodies and agencies carrying out, or assisting in carrying out, development projects meeting the requirement of this title.

(b) Grants may be made under this title only for development projects in metropolitan areas for which it has been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that—

(1) metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing provide an adequate basis fo revaluating (A) the location, financing, and scheduling of individual public facility projects (including, but not limited to, sewer, water, and sewage treatment facilities; highway, mass transit, airport, and other transportation facilities; and recreation and other open-space areas) whether or not federally assisted; and (B) other proposed land development or uses, which projects or uses, because of their size, density, type, or location, have public metropolitanwide or interjurisdictional significance;

(2) adequate metropolitanwide institutional or other arrangements exists for coordinating, on the basis of such metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing, local public policies and activities affecting the development of the area; and

(3) public facility projects and other land development or uses which have a major impact on the development of the area are, in fact, being carried out in accord with such metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing.

ning and programing.

(c) Where the applicant for a grant under this title is a county, municipality, or other general-purpose unit of local government, it must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that taking into consideration the scope of its authority and responsibilities it is adequately assuring that public facility projects and other land development or uses of public metropolitanwide or interjurisdictional significance are being, and will be, carried out in accord with metropolitan planning and programing meeting the requirements of subsection (b). In making this determination the Secretary shall give special consideration to whether the applicant is effectively assisting in, and conforming to, metropolitan

planning and programing through (1) the location and scheduling of public facility projects, whether or not federally assisted; and (2) the establishment and consistent administration of zoning codes, subdivision regulations, and similar land-use and density controls.

Where the applicant for a grant under this title is not a general-purpose unit of local government, both it and the general-purpose unit of local government having jurisdiction over the location of the project must meet requirements of this subsection.

(d) In making the determinations required under this section, the Secretary shall obtain, and give full consideration to, the comments of the body or bodies (State or local) responsible for planning and programing for the metropolitan area.

(e) No grant shall be made under this title with respect to a development project for which a Federal grant has been made, or a contract of assistance has been entered into, under the legislation referred to in clause 1 of section 105 prior to February 21, 1966, or more than one year prior to the date on which the Secretary has made the determinations required under this section with respect to the applicant and to the area in which the project is located: Provided, That in the case of a project for which a contract of assistance under the legislation referred to in clause 1 of section 105 has been entered into after June 30, 1967, no grant shall be made under this title unless an application for such grant has been made on or before the date of such contract.

Extent of grant

SEC. 103. (a) A grant under this title shall not exceed (1) 20 per centum of the cost of the project for which the grant is made; nor (2) the Federal grant made with respect to the project under the legislation referred to in clause 1 of section 105. In no case shall the total Federal contributions to the cost of such project be more than 80 per centum. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including requirements with respect to non-Federal contributions, grants under this title shall be eligible for inclusion (directly or through refunds or credits) as part of the financing for such projects: Provided, That projects or activities on the basis of which assistance is provided under section 6(c) of the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 shall not be eligible for assistance under this title.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. Appropriations authorized under this title shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriations Acts.

Consultation and certification

SEC. 104. In carrying out the provisions of this title, including the issuance of regulations, the Secretary shall consult with the Department of the Interior; the Department of Commerce; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Federal Aviation Agency with respect to development projects assisted by those departments and agencies; and he shall, for the purpose of section 103, accept their respective certifications as to the cost of those projects and the amount of the non-Federal contribution paid or to be paid to that cost.

Definitions

Sec. 105. As used in this title-

(1) "development project" means a project assisted or to be assisted under section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965; section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; section 120(a) of title 23, United States Code; section 9 of the Federal Airport Act; section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964; title VII of the Housing Act of 1961; section 5(e) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; or section 101(a) (1) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of

1965 (for a project of a type which the Secretary determines to be eligible for assistance under other of the provisions listed above):

(2) "State" means any State of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or an agency or instru-

mentality of any of the foregoing;

(3) "metropolitan area" means a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget, subject, however, to such modifications and extensions as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate; and

(4) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

TITLE II—LAND DEVELOPMENT AND NEW

COMMUNITIES

Mortgage insurance for new communities
SEC. 201. Title X of the National Housing
Act is amended by inserting after section
1003 the following new section 1004 and redesignating the remaining sections
accordingly:

"New communities

"Sec. 1004. (a) New communities consisting of developments, satisfying all other requirements under this title, may be approved under this section by the Secretary for mortgage insurance if they meet the requirements of subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) A development shall be eligible for approval as a new community if the Secretary determines it will, in view of its size and scope, make a substantial contribution to the sound and economic growth of the area within which it is located in the form of—

"(1) substantial economies, made possible through large-scale development, in the provision of improved residential sites;

"(2) adequate housing to be provided for those who would be employed in the com-

munity or the surrounding area;

"(3) maximum accessibility from the new residential sites to industrial or other employment centers and commercial, recreational, and cultural facilities in or near the community; and

"(4) maximum accessibility to any major central city in the area".

Mortgage amount and term

Sec. 202. (a) Section 1002(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000".

(b) Section 1002(d)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) contain repayment provisions satisfactory to the Secretary and have a maturity not to exceed seven years, or such longer maturity as the Secretary deems reasonable (A) in the case of a privately owned system for water or sewerage, and (B) in the case of a new community approved under section 1004:".

Encouragement of small builders

Sec. 203. Section 1004 of such Act (redesignated as section 1005) is amended by adding after "broad participation by builders," the words "particularly small builders,".

Water and sewerage facilities

SEC. 204. Section 1005 of such Act (redesignated as section 1006) is amended by adding the following: "In the case of a new community approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 1004, the land shall be served, after its development, by—

"(a) public systems for water and sewerage which are consistent with other existing or prospective systems within the area; or

"(b) existing privately or cooperatively owned systems (including reasonable extensions thereto) which are approved as adequate by the Secretary and are regulated in a manner acceptable to him; or

"(c) if it is necessary to develop a new system and the Secretary determines that public ownership of such a system is not feasible, an adequate privately or cooperatively owned new system (1) which he finds consistent with other existing or prospective systems within the area; (2) which will be regulated, during the period of such ownership, in a manner acceptable to him with respect to user rates and charges, capital structure, methods of operation, and rate of return; and (3) regarding which he receives assurances, satisfactory to him, with respect to eventual public ownership and operation of the system and with respect to the conditions and terms of any sale or transfer."

Federal National Mortgage Association special assistance for new communities

SEC. 205. Section 302(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after "or title VIII," in the proviso the following: "or under title X with respect to a new community approved under section 1004 thereof,".

Urban planning grants

SEC. 206. Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting the following before the semicolon in paragraph (4): ", or for areas where rapid urbanization expected to result on land acquired or to be acquired by land development agencies with assistance under section 202(b)(1) of the Housing Amendments of 1955, or on land developed or to be developed as a new community approved under section 1004 of the National Housing Act".

Public facility loans

SEC. 207. Section 202(b) (redesignated below as section 202(c)) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding the following before the period at the end of the second sentence of paragraph (4): ", or (iii) to be provided in connection with the establishment of a new community approved under section 1004 of the National Housing Act".

Loans to land development agencies

SEC. 208. (a) Section 202 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b) and redesignating the remaining subsections accordingly:

(b) (1) In order to encourage and assist in the timely acquisition of open or predominantly undeveloped land to be utilized in connection with the development of wellplanned residential neighborhoods, subdivisions, and communities, the Secretary is authorized to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, land development agencies to finance the acquisition of a fee simple or other interest in such land for subsequent sale in accordance with this subsection. A loan under this subsection may be in an amount which shall not exceed the total cost, as approved by the Secretary, of acquiring such interest; shall be reasonably secured; shall be repaid in such manner and within such period, not exceeding fifteen years, as may be determined by the Secretary; and shall bear interest at the rate prescribed for financial assistance extended under subsection (a) of this section. As used in this subsection, 'land development agencies' means public corporations, including municipalities, authorized to carry out, and created or designated by or pursuant to State law for the purpose of carrying out, the func-tions for which financial assistance is available under this subsection.

"(2) The Secretary shall not extend any financial assistance for the acquisition of land under this subsection unless he determines that (A) the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms, (B) the development of a well-planned residential neighborhood, subdivision, or community on such land would be consistent with a comprehensive plan or comprehensive planning, meeting criteria established by the Secretary, for the area in which the land is located, and (C) a prelimi-

nary development plan for the use of the land meets criteria established by the Secretary for such preliminary plans.

(3) Land acquired with financial assistance under this subsection shall be disposed of for development in accordance with a current development plan for the land which has been approved by the Secretary as consistent with provisions of the loan agreement, and shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of for less than its fair value for uses in accord with such development plan. Such plan shall, wherever feasible in the light of current conditions, encourage the provision of sites providing a proper balance of types of housing to serve families having a broad range of incomes. The Secretary shall adopt such requirements as he deems necessary to encourage the maintenance of a diversified local homebuilding industry and broad par-ticipation by builders, particularly small builders.

(b) The proviso in section 203(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by

(1) striking out "section 202(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 202(a) and pursuant to section 202(b)"; and

pursuant to section 202(b)"; and
(2) striking out "of such section" and inserting in lieu thereof "of section 202(a)".

TITLE III—URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Increase in grant authorization

SEC. 301. (a) Section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967" and substituting "\$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967; and \$95,000,000 for fiscal year 1968".

(b) Section 6(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "and to \$30,000,000 on July 1, 1966" and substituting "\$30,000,000 on July 1, 1966; and to \$40,000,000 on July 1, 1967".

TITLE IV—GRANTS FOR URBAN INFORMATION CENTERS

Findings and purpose

Sec. 401. (a) The Congress hereby finds that one of the principal impediments to coordinated and effective Federal, State, and local efforts in solving the problems of metropolitan and other urban areas is the lack of ready availability of information respecting the public and private programs and activities directed to their solution. The Congress further finds that the establishment of centers providing information on urban programs and resources would increase the effectiveness of present Federal, State, and local efforts to solve urban problems.

(b) It is the purpose of this title to assist States and metropolitan areas in demonstrating the value of improved and increased efforts in assembling and making available information and data on urban needs and assistance programs and activities through centers established for such purpose.

Grant authority

Sec. 402. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and metropolitanarea agencies to help finance demonstration programs for the assembly, correlation, and dissemination of information and data needed for improving, coordinating, and more effectively utilizing governmental and other programs and activities available for the solution of local urban problems. Such demonstration programs shall include:

(1) the planning, establishment, and operation of urban information centers; and

(2) the assembly, correlation, and dissemination of urban physical, social, and economic development information and data through such centers for the purposes of:

(A) informing local governments, organizations, and individuals of the availability and status of Federal, State, and local programs and other resources for the solution of urban problems;

(B) providing Federal, State, and local governments with information useful and

necessary to planning, programing, budgeting, and coordinating urban programs; or

providing other information and data needed for public and private urban physical, social, and economic development activities.

(b) A demonstration program assisted un-

der this section shall:

(1) specify the activities to be carried on and the kinds of information to be assembled and distributed;

(2) adequately justify its choice of activities, in terms of specified urban physical, social, and economic information needs and objectives, including comparisons of cost

and usefulness where appropriate;
(3) represent substantially increased or improved activities on the part of the applicant State or metropolitan-area agency;

(4) contain a detailed budget together with procedures for adequate fiscal control,

fund accounting, and auditing;

(5) be closely coordinated with related Federal, State, and local informational activities, including those receiving assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and other Federal programs;

(6) not include any activity receiving assistance under other Federal programs; and (7) meet such other requirements as the Secretary may establish to carry out the

purpose of this title.

Extent of activities

SEC. 403. (a) An urban information center established by a metropolitan-area agency under this title shall be directed primarily to the provision of informational services of general metropolitanwide utility or of utility to the communities within that metropolitan area.

(b) An urban information center established by a State under this title shall be directed primarily to the provision of informational services of general statewide utility or of utility to communities not within metropolitan areas for which information centers have been established under this title.

Amount of grant

SEC. 404. (a) A grant under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of the activities carried on under an approved

program during one year.

(b) No grant shall be made under this title to assist in assembling data, or providing information, to be used primarily in the day-

to-day operations of State or local governing bodies and agencies.

Federal information activities

SEC. 405. (a) Federal departments and agencies shall cooperate with States and metropolitan-area agencies in providing information to assist in carrying out the purpose of this title.

(b) The President shall undertake such studies to improve Federal agency program information capability and coordination as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

Evaluation of program

Sec. 406. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable but not later than June 30, 1971, report to the President as to the effectiveness of the assistance provided under this title, and submit recommendations and appropriate legislative proposals regarding its termination or continuance.

Definitions

Sec. 407. As used in this title—
(1) "State" means any State of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or an agency or instrumentality designated by the chief executive

of any of the foregoing;
(2) "metropolitan area" means a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget, subject how-

ever to such modifications and extensions as the Secretary may determine to be

appropriate;

"metropolitan-area agency" (3) means an organization or body composed of public officials which the Secretary determines to be representative of the political jurisdictions encompassing a metropolitan area; or (B) where no such organization exists and can qualify for a grant under this title, a public body or agency (i) designated by the governing body of that political ju-risdiction within the area which contains the largest population, according to the most recent decennial census, and (ii) concurred in by other local political jurisdictions which, together with the designating jurisdiction, contain at least two-thirds of the population of the area; and
(4) "Secretary" means the Secretary of

Housing and Urban Development.

Appropriations

SEC. 408. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title: Provided, That such appropriations shall not exceed \$5,000,000 before July 1, 1967, nor exceed \$10,000,000 before July 1, 1968. Appropriations authorized under this title shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriations acts.

The section-by-section summary accompanying Senate bill 2977 is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

Section 1. Short title: The bill would be cited as the "Urban Development Act."

TITLE I. GRANTS TO ASSIST IN PLANNED METRO-POLITAN DEVELOPMENT

This title would provide the incentives for effective metropolitan planning and development recommended by the President in his recent message on city demostration programs. The major new objective is assurance of actual physical development of projects in the metropolitan area in accordance with the planning. The incentive consists of increased aid to federally assisted projects of a type which generally affect the growth of such area. This incentive would be given only where all public and private development in the area having a major regional impact is consistent with planned metropolitan development.

Section 101. Findings and declaration of purpose: Subsection (a) of this section would set forth congressional findings (1) that it is essential that metropolitan areas prepare, keep current, and actually carry out comprehensive plans and programs for their orderly physical development; (2) that these areas are especially handicapped by the complexity and scope of governmental services required, the multiplicity of political jurisdictions and agencies involved, and the in-adequacy of the operational and administrative arrangements available for cooperation among them; (3) that present requirements for areawide planning and programing in connection with various Federal programs have materially assisted in the solution of metropolitan problems; but (4) that additional participation and cooperation are needed from the States and localities in perfecting and carrying out such areawide efforts.

Subsection (b) of this section would declare that the purpose of this title is to provide additional encouragement and assistance to States and localities, through sup-plementary grants for certain federally assisted development projects, for making effective comprehensive metropolitan planning and programing.

Section 102. Grant authority: Subsection (a) of this section would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

to make supplementary grants to applicant State and local public bodies and agencies carrying out, or assisting in carrying out, development projects meeting the requirements of this title.

Subsection (b) of this section would specify that grants may be made under this title only for development projects in metropolitan areas for which it has been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing provide an adequate basis for evaluating as to consistency (A) the location, financing, and scheduling of individual public facility projects (including, but not limited to, sewer, water, and sewage treatment facilities; highway, mass transit, airport, and other transportation facilities; and recreation and other open-space areas) whether or not federally assisted; and (B) other proposed land development or uses, which projects or uses, because of their size, density, type, or location, have public metropolitanwide or interjurisdictional significance.

In addition, no metropolitan area would be eligible for the grants unless it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary that adequate metropolitanwide institutional or other arrangements, such as a metropolitan council of governments, exist for coordinating local public development policies and activities on the basis of the metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing; and that public facility projects and other land development or uses (public or private) which have a major impact on the development of the area are, in fact, being carried out in accord with the metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and program-

Subsection (c) of this section would specify that where the applicant for a grant under this title is a county, municipality, or other general-purpose unit of local government, it must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Secretary that taking into consideration the scope of its authority and responsibilities it is adequately assuring that public facility projects and other land development or uses of public metropolitanwide or interjurisdictional significance are being, and will be, carried out in accord with metropolitan planning and programing meeting the requirements of subsection (b). In making this determination the Secretary is to give special consideration to whether the applicant is effectively assisting in, and conforming to, metropolitan planning and programing through (1) the location and scheduling of public facility projects (including, but not limited to, sewer, water, and sewage treat-ment facilities; highway, mass transit, airport, and other transportation facilities; and recreation and other open-space areas) whether or not federally assisted; and (2) its establishment and consistent administration of zoning codes, subdivision regulations, and similar land-use and density con-

This subsection would further specify that where the applicant for a grant under this title is not a general-purpose unit of local government, both it and the general-purpose unit of local government having jurisdiction over the location of the project must meet the requirements of this subsection.

Under subsection (c) of this section, a political jurisdiction could receive these supplementary grants although some of its neighboring jurisdictions in the metropolitan area are ineligible for the aid because of departures from comprehensive metropolitan planning. However, under subsection (b), where such a departure by any jurisdiction in the metropolitan area has a major impact on the development of the metropolitan area, no jurisdiction in that area would be eligible for the supplementary grants under this title.

Subsection (d) of this section would specify that, in making the determination required under this section, the Secretary is to obtain, and give full consideration to, the comments of the body or bodies (State or local) responsible for planning and program-

ing for the metropolitan area.

Subsection (e) of this section would provide that no grant may be made under this title with respect to a development project for which a Federal grant has been made, or a contract of assistance has been entered into, under the legislation referred to in clause 1 of section 105 prior to February 1966 (date of introduction), or more than 1 year prior to the date on which the Secretary has made the determinations required under this section with respect to the applicant and to the area in which the project is located. In the case of a project for which a contract of assistance under the legislation referred to in clause 1 of section 105 has been entered into after June 30, 1967, there is a further provision that no grant may be made under this title unless an application for such grant has been made on or before the date of such contract.

Section 103. Extent of grant: Subsection (a) of this section would limit a grant under this title to 20 percent of the cost of the project for which the grant is made. Also, the grant under this title could never exceed the Federal grant made to the project under other legislation. In no case are the total Federal contributions to the cost of such projects to be more than 80 percent.

It would be specified that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, including requirements with respect to non-Federal contributions, grants under this title would be eligible for inclusion (directly or through refunds or credits when a portion of the local share has meanwhile been paid in) as a part of the financing for such projects. Projects or activities on the basis of which assistance is received under section 6(c) of the Demonstration Citles Act of 1966 are not to be eligible for assistance under this title.

Subsection (b) of this section would authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. Such appropriations would remain available until expended, when so pro-

vided in appropriations acts.

Section 104. Consultation and certification: This section would require the Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of this title, including the issuance of regulations, to consult with the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Federal Aviation Agency with respect to development projects assisted by those departments and agencies and, for the purpose of section 103 of this title, to accept their respective certifications as to the cost of those projects and the amount of the non-Federal contribution paid or to be paid to that cost.

Section 105. Definitions: This section would define certain terms used in the title:

- 1. "Development project" is defined to mean a State or local project assisted under certain specified Federal programs. (These programs are those which most often involve projects affecting the pattern of local land use and local growth.) The specified programs are—
- (a) Grants for basic water and sewer facilities, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;
- (b) Grants for construction of sewage treatment works, administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act;
- (c) Grants for highway construction (Federal-aid primary and secondary systems,

but not the Interstate System) administered by the Department of Commerce under section 120(a) of title 23, United States Code;

- (d) Grants for airport development, administered by the Federal Aviation Agency under section 9 of the Federal Airport Act;
- (e) Grants for urban mass transportation facilities and equipment, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964;
- (f) Grants for acquisition and development of open space, or for beautification and improvement of public land, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under title VII of the Housing Act of 1961:
- (g) Grants for the acquisition and development of lands and waters for recreational purposes, administered by the Department of the Interior under section 5(e) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; and
- (h) Grants for public works and facilities, administered by the Department of Commerce under section 101(a) (1) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (but only if they involve works or facilities of a type which the Secretary determines to be eligible under sections (a) through (g) above).

 "State" means any State of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or an agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing.

- 3. "Metropolitan area" means a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget, subject however to such modifications and extensions as the Secretary may determine to be appropri-
- 4. "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

TITLE II. LAND DEVELOPMENT AND NEW COMMUNITIES

This title would expand the FHA mortgage insurance program for privately financed land development under title X of the National Housing Act (which was enacted as part of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965). It would authorize the Secretary to approve "new communities" for which certain special aids would be available, and would increase from \$10 million to \$25 million the maximum outstanding mortgage amount permitted under title X. In addition, this title would (in section 208) authorize loans by the Secretary to State or local land development agencies (which would be public corporations, including municipalities) to finance the acquisition of land to be utilized in connection with the development of well-planned residential neighborhoods, subdivisions, and communities,

Section 201. Mortgage insurance for new communities: This section would authorize the Secretary to approve a category of "new communities" for mortgage insurance under title X. These would consist of land developments, satisfying all other requirements under the title, which meet the special requirements of the section. (Subsequent sections of this title would authorize longer mortgage maturities and FNMA special assistance for this category of land development which would not be available to land developments, even though very extensive, which are not approved as meeting the special requirements.)

- A development would be eligible for approval as a new community if the Secretary determines it will, in view of its size and scope, make a substantial contribution to the sound and economic growth of the area within which it is located. Such contribution would be in the form of—
- 1. Substantial economies, made possible through large-scale development, in the provision of improved residential sites:

2. Adequate housing to be provided for those who would be employed in the community or the surrounding area;

3. Maximum accessibility from the new residential sites to industrial or other employment centers and commercial, recreational, and cultural facilities in or near the community; and

4. Maximum accessibility to any major central city in the area.

This section contemplates development planned to provide a wide range of urban facilities and services, while maintaining close ties with any nearby major city.

The objectives and planning criteria for the existing land development program would also be applicable with respect to new communities. The Secretary would, under already enacted provisions of title X, review the site development plan to determine that it was consistent with overall comprehensive plans or planning actually being carried out for the area in which the community is to be located.

Section 202. Mortgage amount and term: This section would increase from \$10 million to \$25 million the maximum mortgage amount permitted at any one time for a single land development under title X. This increase would provide the flexibility needed to assure sufficient credit assistance for very large developments, including new communities or very large subdivisions.

The section would also exempt new communities approved by the Secretary from the 7-year maximum mortgage maturity generally applicable under existing law to mortgages under the land development program. Such an exemption is already provided in the case of privately owned water or sewerage

systems.

Section 203. Encouragement of small builders: This section would make it clear that the present requirements for encouraging broad participation by builders in the land development program are intended particularly to encourage participation by small builders.

Section 204. Water and sewerage facilities: This section would require that in the case of a new community approved by the Secretary, the land shall be served, after its development, by (1) public systems for water and sewerage which are consistent with other existing or prospective systems in the area, or (2) by existing privately or cooperatively owned systems (including reasonable extensions thereto) which are approved by the Secretary and are regulated in a manner acceptable to him. However, the section also provides that, where there is no existing system that can serve the area and the Secretary determines that public ownership of a new system is not feasible, the land may be served by an adequate privately or cooperatively owned new system, under the following conditions:

1. The Secretary finds the system consistent with other existing or prospective

systems within the area;

2. The system will be regulated, during the period of such private or cooperative ownership, in a manner acceptable to the Secretary with respect to user rates and charges, capital structure, methods of operation, and rate of return; and

3. The Secretary receives assurances, satisfactory to him, with respect to eventual public ownership and operation of the system and with respect to the conditions and terms

of any sale or transfer.

Section 205. Federal National Mortgage Association special assistance for new communities: This section would, where the aid is needed, make FHA-insured mortgages with respect to new communities eligible for purchase by the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance program. FHA-insured land development mortgages are now eligible for FNMA purchase under its secondary market program.

Section 206. Urban planning grants: This section would make urban planning grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 available to official governmental planning agencies for areas where new communities are to be developed with mortgage insurance assistance or where land is being acquired by land development agencies designated or created pursuant to State law. (Federal grants to local planning agencies for such planning are now available for metropolitan areas, depressed areas, and federally impacted

Section 207. Public facility loans: This section would waive the population limit (50,000) on the political jurisdiction eligible to receive public facility loans under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 in the case of public facilities serving new communities within such large jurisdictions.

Section 208. Loans to land development agencies: This section would authorize the Secretary to make loans to land development agencies to finance the acquisition of land to be utilized in connection with the development of well-planned residential neighborhoods, subdivisions, and communities. These land development agencies would include municipalities and other public corporations which are designated or created pursuant to State law. The land acquired would be sold to private builders, possibly after in-stallation of basic public facilities, for the construction of well-planned developments. These could be residential neighborhoods, housing subdivisions, or more extensive developments, including new communities. The land could be developed by the private owners with or without the mortgage insurance assistance available under title X of the National Housing Act.

The loans would be limited to an amount not exceeding the total cost, as approved by the Secretary, of the acquisition of a fee simple or other interest in the land. would be required to be reasonably secured and would be repayable within a period not exceeding 15 years at an interest rate of not more than the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth percent, plus one-half percent. For the current fiscal year this formula produces an interest

rate of 4 percent.

Loans for land acquisition would not be made unless the Secretary determines that: 1. Private financing is not otherwise avail-

able on reasonable terms;

2. The development of a well-planned residential neighborhood, housing subdivision, or community on the land would be consistent with a comprehensive plan or with comprehensive planning, meeting criteria estab-lished by the Secretary, for the area in which the land is located; and

3. A preliminary development plan for the use of the land meets criteria which he has

established.

The criteria for comprehensive planning would include criteria designed to assure maximum accessibility of the planned developments to any major central cities in the

The land acquired would be required to be developed in accordance with a development plan approved by the Secretary as consistent with the provisions of the loan agreement. Sales of the land to private persons could not be for less than its fair value for uses in accord with the approved development plan. A development plan, wherever feasible in the light of current conditions, would be required to encourage the provision of sites providing a proper balance of types of housing to serve families having a broad range incomes. The Secretary would adopt requirements necessary to encourage the maintenance of a diversified local homebuilding industry and broad participation by builders, particularly small builders.

This program would assist the State governments that wish to establish land development agencies in order to take advantage of the State government's unique powers to promote the planned development of future urban growth. Cities, counties, and other political subdivisions could be designated by or under State law as land development agencies to participate in this program.

The loans authorized would be made from the revolving fund established by title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to finance the public facility loans program. No additional authorization is now necessary. It is estimated that during the first full year of funds operations the amount of Federal committed for these new loans would not exceed \$25 million.

TITLE III. URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Section 301. Increase in grant authorization: Subsection (a) would increase by \$95 million the authorization for grants under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. This act presently authorizes the appropriation of \$75 million for grants for fiscal year 1965 and \$150 million for each of fiscal years 1966 and 1967. Amounts authorized for a particular year but not appropriated may instead be appropriated for any later year.

Only \$320 million of the present \$375 million authorization has been appropriated, including \$130 million provided, by "advance appropriation," for fiscal year 1967. The remaining \$55 million authorization, plus the proposed additional \$95 million. will be needed for the \$150 million program level

proposed for fiscal year 1968.

Appropriations are needed now for fiscal 1968 in order to continue the present policy of providing advance appropriations for this program, at least a year ahead of the current fiscal year. Such advance appropriations provide necessary assurance to the urban areas making use of these grants that Federal funds will in fact be available for local projects when needed. These projects frequently take several years to plan and institute, and it is greatly in the Federal interest to encourage, rather than discourage, adequate planning for them.

Subsection (b) would make a corresponding change in the provision in the act authorizing up to \$10 million per year for research, development and demonstration projects. An additional \$10 million would be authorized for such projects, during fiscal year 1968.

TITLE IV. GRANTS FOR URBAN INFORMATION CENTERS

Section 401. Findings and purpose: Subsection (a) of this section would set forth congressional findings that one of the principal impediments to coordinated and effective Federal, State, and local efforts in solving the problems of metropolitan and other urban areas is the lack of ready availability of information respecting the public and private programs and activities directed to their solution; and that the establishment of centers providing information on urban programs and resources would increase the effectiveness of present Federal, State, and local efforts to solve urban problems.

Subsection (b) of this section would declare the purpose of this title to be to assist States and metropolitan areas in demonstrating the value of improved and increased efforts in assembling and making available information and data on urban needs and assistance programs and activities through centers established for such purposes.

Section 402. Grant authority: Subsection (a) of this section would authorize the Secretary to make grants to States and metropolitan-area agencies to help finance demonstration programs for the assembly, cor-relation, and dissemination of information and data needed for improving, coordinating, and more effectively utilizing governmental and other programs and activities available for the solution of local urban problems. These demonstration programs are to include the planning, establishment, and operation of urban information centers; and the assembly, correlation, and dissemination of urban physical, social, and economic development information and data through such centers for the purposes of:

1. Informing local governments, organiza-tions, and individuals of the availability and status of Federal, State, and local programs and other resources for the solution of urban

problems:

2. Providing Federal, State, and local governments with information useful and necessary to planning, programing, budgeting, and coordinating urban programs; or

3. Providing other information and data needed for public and private urban physical, social, and economic development activities.

The programs would not include collecting original data, such as population data. Subsection (b) of this section would re-

quire a demonstration program assisted under this section to:

- 1. Specify the activities to be carried on and the kinds of information to be assembled and distributed:
- 2. Adequately justify its choice of activities, in terms of specified urban physical, social, and economic information needs and objectives, including comparisons of cost and usefulness where appropriate;

3. Represent substantially increased or improved activities on the part of the applicant State or metropolitan-area agency;

4. Contain a detailed budget together with procedures for adequate fiscal control, fund

accounting, and auditing;
5. Be closely coordinated with related Federal, State, and local informational activities, including those receiving assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and other Federal programs;

6. Not include any activity receiving as-

sistance under other Federal programs; and 7. Meet such other requirements as the Secretary may establish to carry out the purpose of this title.

Section 403. Extent of activities: Subsection (a) of this section would require an urban information center established by a metropolitan-area agency under this title to be directed primarily to the provision of informational services of general metropolitanwide utility or of utility to the communities within that metropolitan area.

Subsection (b) of this section would require an urban information center established by a State under this title to be directed primarily to the provision of informational services of general statewide utility or of utility to communities not within metropolitan areas for which information centers have been established under this title.

Section 404. Amount of grant: Subsection (a) of this section would limit a grant under this section to 50 percent of the cost of the activities carried on under an approved pro-

gram during 1 year.

Subsection (b) of this section would prohibit grants under this title to assist in assembling data or providing information, to be used primarily in the day-to-day operations of State or local governing bodies and agencies

Section 405. Federal information activities: Subsection (a) of this section would require Federal departments and agencies to cooperate with States and metropolitan-area agencies in providing information to assist in carrying out the purpose of this title.

Subsection (b) of this section would require the President to undertake such studes to improve Federal agency program information capability and coordination as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

Section 406. Evaluation of program: This section would require the Secretary, as soon as practicable but not later than June 30, 1971, to report to the President as to the effectiveness of the assistance provided under this title, and to submit recommendations and appropriate legislative proposals regarding its termination or continuance.

Section 407. Definitions: This section would specify that, as used in this title—

1. "State" means any State of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or an agency or instrumentality designated by the chief executive

of any of the foregoing;
2. "metropolitan area" means a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget, subject however to such modifications and extensions as the Secretary may determine to be ap-

propriate: 3. "metropolitan-area agency" means (A) an organization or body composed of public officials which the Secretary determines to be representative of the political jurisdictions encompassing a metropolitan area; or (B) where no such organization exists and can qualify for a grant under this title, a public body or agency (i) designated by the governing body of that political jurisdiction within the area which contains the largest population, according to the most recent decennial census, and (ii) concurred in by other local political jurisdictions which, together with the designating jurisdiction, contain at least two-thirds of the population of the area; and

4. "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Section 408. Appropriations: This section would authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. However, such appropriations are not to exceed \$5 million before July 1, 1967, nor exceed \$10 million before July 1, 1968. Appropriations authorized under this title are to remain available until expended when so provided in appropriations acts.

S. 2978

A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Housing and Urban Development Amendments of 1966".

TITLE I-HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

FHA-insured property improvement loans SEC. 101. Section 2 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end of subsection (f) a new sentence as follows: "The amount of such premium charge with respect to loans made or refinanced within one year after the date of enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Amendments of 1966 may be included in computing the cost of improvements or of refinancing and may be deducted by the lender from the loan proceeds.".

Cooperative housing insurance fund

SEC. 102. Section 213 of the National Housing Act is amended by

(1) striking out ", but only in cases where the consent of the mortgagee or lender to the transfer is obtained or a request by the mortgagee or lender for the transfer is received by the Commissioner within such period of time after the date of the enactment of this subsection as the Commissioner shall prescribe" preceding the colon before the proviso in subsection (m);

(2) striking out "insured under this section and sections 207, 231 and 232" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "the insurance of which is the obligation of either

the Management Fund or the General Insurance Fund"; and

(3) adding a new sentence at the end of subsection (n) as follows: "Premium charges on the insurance of mortgages or loans transferred to the Management Fund or insured pursuant to commitments transferred to the Management Fund may be payable in debentures which are the obligation of either the Management Fund or of the General Insurance Fund.'

Mortgage limits for homes under section 221(d)(2)

Sec. 103. Section 221(d)(2)(A) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "\$11,000" and "\$18,000" and inserting in lleu thereof "\$12,500" and "\$20,000", respec-

Low-rent housing for displaced families-Term of lease

SEC. 104. Section 23(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "Provided. That the term may exceed thirtysix months where the public housing agency determines that the housing leased under this section is needed for displaced families."

Low-rent housing-Use of newly constructed private housing

SEC. 105. (a) Section 10(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "existing structures" in the last proviso, and inserting in lieu thereof "private accommodations".

(b) Section 23(a)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out from the first clause thereof the words "an existing" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "a".

Applying advances in technology to housing and urban development

SEC. 106. (a) To encourage and assist the housing industry to continue to reduce the cost and improve the quality of housing by the application to home construction of advances in technology, and to encourage and assist the application of advances in technology to urban development activities, the Secretary is directed to-

(1) conduct research and studies to test and demonstrate new and improved techniques and methods of applying advances in technology to housing construction, rehabilitation and maintenance, and urban development activities; and

(2) encourage and promote the acceptance and application of new and improved techniques and methods of constructing, rehabilitating and maintaining housing and the application of advances in technology to urban development activities by all segments of the housing industry, communities, industries engaged in urban development activities and the general public.

(b) Research and studies conducted under this section shall be designed to test and demonstrate the applicability to housing construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and urban development activities, of advances in technology relating to (1) design concepts, (2) construction and rehabilitation methods, (3) manufacturing processes, (4) materials and products, and (5) building components.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to carry out the research and studies authorized by this section either directly or by contract with public or private bodies or agenices, or by working agreement with departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as he may determine to be desirable. Contracts may be made by the Secretary for research and studies authorized by this section for work to continue not more than two years from the date of any such contract.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. All funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation acts.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Secretary under title III of the Housing Act of 1948, section 602 of the Housing Act of 1956, or any other provision of law.

Rehabilitation and code enforcement grants

SEC. 107. The second proviso under the head "Urban Renewal Administration" in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966, is

Mortgage insurance for land development-Clarifying amendment

SEC. 108. (a) Section 1001(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "'mortgage'" and inserting in lieu thereof "'mortgagee'".

(b) Section 1001(d) of the National Hous-

ing Act is amended-

(1) by inserting after the words "sewerage disposal installations," the following: "steam, gas, and electric lines and installations,";

(2) by striking out the semicolon after "or common use", and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following new sentence: "Related uses may include industrial uses, with sites for such uses to be in proper proportion to the size and scope of the development.":

(3) by striking out "but such term" and inserting in lieu thereof; "The term improve-

ments"; and
(4) by inserting after "sewage disposal installation," in clause (1) the following: "or a steam, gas, or electric line or installation,".

(c) Section 512 of such Act is amended by striking out "or IX" and inserting in lieu thereof "IX, or X".

Repeal of provision for sale of Forest Hills Project, Paducah

SEC. 109. Section 1005 of the Housing Act of 1964 is hereby repealed.

Technical amendments

SEC. 110. (a) Section 106(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is repealed.

(b) Section 113(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 and section 701(a)(3) of the Housing Act of 1954 are amended by inserting "(or any act supplementary thereto)" after "Area Redevelopment Act". (c) Section 227(a) of the National Hous-

ing Act is amended by striking out "subsection (b) (2)" in clause (vi) and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (b)".

(d) Section 304(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "and the Association shall not purchase any mortgage insured or guaranteed prior to the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954".

(e) The last sentence of section 305(e) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "supplementing" and inserting in lieu thereof "supplementary"

(f) Section 308 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "(a)".

TITLE II-CONFORMING NOMENCLATURE STATUTES TO DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

SEC. 201. (a) The National Housing Act is amended-

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" each place it appears and in-serting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Hous-ing and Urban Development";

(3) by striking out "Commissioner" each

place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(4) by striking out "Commissioner's" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary's".

(b) The heading appearing above section 1 of such Act is amended by striking out "Creation of Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Administrative Provisions'

(c) Section 1 of such Act is amended-

(1) by striking out the first paragraph; (2) by adding after "Secretary" where it first appears in the second paragraph the following: "(hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')"; and
(3) by striking out "Administration" in

the last sentence of the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "Department".

(d) Sections 2(c)(2), 204(g), 604(g) and 904(f) of such Act are amended by striking out "the Commissioner or by any Assistant Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "an officer".

(e) The first sentence of section 206 of such Act is amended by striking out "shall be deposited" and inserting in lieu thereof "related to insurance under section 203 shall

be deposited".

- (f) The first sentence of section 209 of such Act is amended by adding "in connection with the insurance programs" after
- (g) Section 220(d)(1)(A) of such Act is amended-
- (1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof

'Secretary'

- (3) by striking out "certification to the Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "determination"; and
- (4) by striking out each place it appears "certified to the Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "determined".

(h) Section 223(a)(2) of such Act is amended-

- (1) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development":
- (2) by striking out "said Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"
- (i) The heading appearing above section 226 of such Act is amended by striking out "FHA"
- (j) Section 302(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the Department of Housing and Urban Development".
- (k) Sections 302(c) and 306(e) are amended by striking out "House and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development or its Secretary".

(1) Sections 303(g) and 308 of such Act are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

- (m) Section 308 of such Act is further amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".
- (n) The third paragraph of section 603(a) is amended by striking out "in any field office of" and inserting in lieu thereof "by"
- (o) The second paragraph of section 610 of such Act is amended-
- (1) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and
- (2) by striking out "said Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".
- (p) Section 803(b)(2) of such Act is amended-
- (1) by striking out "Secretary or his designee" in the first sentence and inserting ignee" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense or his designee":

- (2) by striking out "certified by the Secretary" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "certified by the Secretary of Defense":
- (3) by striking out "require the Secretary" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "require the Secretary of De-
- fense"; and
 (4) by striking out "Secretary to guarantee" in the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense to guarantee".
- (q) Section 807 of such Act is amended by striking out the second sentence.

(r) Section 809 is amended-

(1) by striking out "Secretary or his designee" in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense or his designee";

(2) by striking out "Secretary to guarantee" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense to guarantee";

(3) by striking out "'Secretary or his designee', and 'Secretary'" in subsection (g) (2) (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "'Secretary of Defense or his designee', and 'Secretary of Defense' "; and

by striking out "such Administration" (4) in both places it appears in subsection (g) (2) (iii) and inserting in lieu thereof tional Aeronautics and Space Administra-

(s) Section 903(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Develop-

ment". (t) Section 903(d) of such Act is amended by striking out ", with the approval of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator,".

(u) Section 1003(b)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

SEC. 202. (a) The United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(b) Section 3 of such Act is amended by

(1) striking out "Department of the Interior" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "an Administrator," and all that follows in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary.";

(3) by striking out the first sentence of subsection (c); and

(4) by striking out "neither the administrator nor any" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "no".

(c) Section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out subsections (a) and (b) and re-designating subsections (c) and (d) as (a) and (b).

(d) Section 5(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "shall sue" and inserting in lieu thereof "may sue".

(e) Subsection (c) of section 5 of such Act is deleted and subsections (d) and (e) are redesignated as (c) and (d), respectively.

 (f) Section 7(b) of such Act is amended—
 (1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(g) Section 13 of such Act is amended by striking out "4(d)" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "4(b)".

(h) Section 16(1) of such Act is amended by striking out in the proviso "suits shall" and inserting in lieu thereof "suits may".

(i) Subsections (3) and (4) of section 16 of such Act are deleted and subsection (5) is redesignated as (3).

(j) Section 22 of such Act is amended by striking out "first" in the proviso at the end of subsection (b).

SEC. 203. Section 20 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act is amended-

(a) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter in this section referred to as the Administrator)" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter in this section referred to as the Secretary)"; and
(b) by striking out "Administrator" each

place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof

'Secretary

SEC. 204. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by striking out "Federal Public Housing Authority (or Public Housing Administration)" and inserting in lieu thereof "United States Housing Authority". SEC. 205. (a) Section 301 of the Housing

Act of 1948 is amended-

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development":

(2) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(3) by striking out the last two sentences of subsection (a)

(b) Section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(c) Section 304 of such Act is repealed. (d) Section 502 of such Act is amended-

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears in subsection (a) and in-

serting in lieu thereof "Secretary";
(3) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" each place it appears in the first and fourth sentences of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "United States Housing Authority";

(4) by striking out "Administration" each place it appears in the third sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Authority":

(5) by striking out "shall sue" in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "may sue":

(6) by striking out the second sentence of subsection (b);

(7) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board" at the beginning of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board";

(8) by striking out in subsection (c) "Home Loan Bank Board) the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Federal Home Loan Bank Board)";

(9) by striking out in subsection (c) (3) 'Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board":

(10) by striking out in subsection (c)(3) "said officers or agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "said officer or agency";

(11) by striking out in subsection (d) "Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, may utilize funds made available to them" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary Housing and Urban Development may utilize funds made available to him"; and

(12) by striking out in subsection (d) "of the respective agencies."

SEC. 206. (a) Section 2 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "The Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Department of Housing and

Urban Development".

(b) Title I of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Sec-

retary

(c) Section 101(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "to the constituent agencies

affected".

(d) Section 106(a) of such Act is amended by striking out paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as (1) and

(e) Section 107(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "Public Housing Commis-sioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(f) Section 110(j) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(j) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Develop-

ment"

- (g) Section 601 of such Act is amended by striking out "The Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the head of each constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development'
- (h) The heading above section 605 is repealed.

(1) Section 605 is repealed.
(j) Section 612 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" each place it appears and insert-ing in lieu thereof "Department of Hous-

ing and Urban Development".

SEC. 207. Section 602(d)(11) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or any officer or constituent agency therein," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Department of Housing and Urban Development or any

ficer".
SEC. 208. (a) Title IV of the Housing Act
worded by striking out "Adof 1950 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and in-

serting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

- (b) Section 402(c)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "Federal Security Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare".
- (c) Section 404 of such Act is amended to read as follows:
- "(f) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(d) Section 507 is amended-

- (1) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development", and
- (2) by striking out "Administration" and

(e) Section 508 of such Act is amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

SEC. 209. Section 304 of the Territorial Enabling Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

- SEC. 210. (a) Sections 312, 314, 701, and 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 are amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary
- (b) Section 125 of such Act is amended by striking out "Commissioner" in both places where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".
- (c) Section 314(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance

Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Develop-

- (d) Section 703 of such Act is amended by striking out clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "(2) the term 'Secretary' shall mean the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development:
- (e) Section 801 (a) and (b) of such Act is amended-
- (1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and insert-ing in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing

and Urban Development"; and
(2) by striking out "Commissioner" each
place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof

'Secretary'

(f) Section 802(a) of such Act is amended-

(1) by striking out "FHA";
(2) by striking out "Housing and Home
Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu
thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(3) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu there-of "Department of Housing and Urban De-

velopment".

(g) Section 811 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency, including its constituent agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

 (h) Section 814 of such Act is amended—
 (1) by striking out "Federal Housing Comissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof missioner" "Secretary of Housing and Urban Develop-

ment":

(2) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency (or any official or constituent thereof)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development";

(3) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency (or such official or con-stituent thereof)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(4) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency or any official or constituent agency thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(i) Section 816 of such Act is amended by striking out "Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(1) Section 817 of such Act is amended—
(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

SEC. 211. Sections 32 and 62(a) of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 are amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing

and Urban Development".

SEC. 212. (a) Title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary

(b) Section 102 of such Amendments is amended by striking out subsection (h).

(c) Section 113 of such Act is repealed.

- (d) Section 202 of such Amendments is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".
- (e) Section 403 of such Amendments is amended by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"
- (f) Section 404 of such Amendments is amended-

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing

and Urban Development".

(g) Section 406 of such Amendments is amended-

- (1) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Develop-
- ment";
 (2) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and
- (3) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Develop-
- SEC. 213. (a) Section 104(d) of the Housing Act of 1956 is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(b) Section 602 of such Act is amended— (1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof

'Secretary"; and

(3) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" in subsection (c) and in-serting in lieu thereof "Department of Hous-

ing and Urban Development".

SEC. 214. (a) Section 104 of the Housing Act of 1957 is amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in "Secretary of Housing and Urban lieu thereof Development".

(b) Section 604 of such Act is amended-

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and

Urban Development"; and
(2) by striking out "Housing and Home
Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(c) Section 605 of such Act is amended-(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"

SEC. 215. (a) Sections 52, 53 and 56 of the Alaska Omnibus Act are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(b) Section 53 of such Act is further amended by striking out "Administrator" in the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

SEC. 216. (a) Section 202 of the Housing

Act of 1959 is amended—
(1) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"

(2) by striking out the comma and the clause beginning with "except" at the end of subsection (c) (2); and

(3) by striking out subsection (d) (6) and inserting in lieu thereof "(6) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

of such Act is (b) Section 306(b) amended-

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(c) Sections 802(a) and 808 are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance

Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"

SEC. 217. Section 5 of the Act of September 8, 1960, is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

SEC. 218. (a) Sections 207 and 312 of the Housing Act of 1961 are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

(b) Title VII of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secre-

(c) Section 312 of such Act is further amended by striking out "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"

(d) Section 702 of such Act is amended— (1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator')" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')"; and

(2) by striking out "Secretary from time to time" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Interior from time

to time".

(e) Section 905 of such Act is amended—(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Administration are" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is"; and

(2) by striking out "Administration" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof

'Secretary

SEC. 219. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" in section 224(b) (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 220. Section 2 of the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962 is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

SEC. 221. (a) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and in-

serting in lieu thereof "Secretary (b) Section 9(c)(3) of such

amended to read as follows:

"(3) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;".

(c) The title of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

SEC. 222. (a) Section 312 and Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 are amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"

(b) Section 107(g) of such Act is amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

Section 312 of such Act is further (c) amended-

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out subsection (b) (4) and inserting in lieu thereof, "(4) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and

Urban Development"; and
(3) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" in subsection (c) (4) (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(d) Section 318 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof

"Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"

(e) Section 805 of such Act is amended by striking out "'Administrator' means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(f) Section 810 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of

Housing and Urban Development".

(g) Section 1005 of such Act is amended-(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

- (2) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Develop-
- ment".

 (h) Section 1006 of such Act is amended by striking out "Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".
- (i) Section 1007 of such Act is amended-(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Hous-ing Commissioner are" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is"; and

(2) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof

"Secretary

SEC. 223. (a) The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears in sections 101(c), (d), (e) and (g); 301(b); 313(b); 315(a)(8); 402 and 404(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(b) Title VII of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secre-

tarv".

(c) Section 101 of such Act is amended-(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator')" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')"

(2) by striking out all of the second sentence of subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to any housing assisted under this section, sections 221(d)(3) and 231(c)(3) of the National Housing Act, and section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, including the authority to prescribe occupancy requirements under other provisions of law or to determine the portion of such housing which may be occupied by qualified tenants."

(d) Section 107 of such Act is amended—(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Comin subsection (a) (2) (A) and inmissioner" serting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(e) Section 108(d) of such Act is

amended-

- (1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Secretary"; and
- (2) by striking out "Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".
- (f) Section 301 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in the third sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Develop-
 - (g) Section 315 of such Act is amended-

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) (8) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";
(2) by striking out "Housing and Home

Finance Administrator and Public Housing Commissioner are" in subsections (b) (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is";

(3) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" in subsection (b) (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary

(h) Section 401(5) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(5) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development'

(i) Section 702 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter in this title re-ferred to as the 'Administrator')" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Secretary')"

(j) Section 1113 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof Secretary of Housing and Urban Develop-

ment". SEC. 224. Section 501 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1966 amended-

- (a) by striking out "Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and
- (b) by striking out "Administrator" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Develop-

Sec. 225. (a) Sections 493, 657 and 1006 of Title 18, United States Code, are amended by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(b) The eighth paragraph of section 709 of such Title is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever uses as a firm or business name the words 'Department of Housing and Urban Development', 'Housing and Home Finance Agency', 'Federal Housing Adminis-tration', 'Federal National Mortgage Association'. 'United States Housing Authority' or 'Public Housing Administration' or the letters 'HUD', 'FHA', 'PHA', 'USHA', any combination or variation of those words or the letters 'HUD', 'FHA', 'PHA', or 'USHA' alone or with other words or letters reasonably calculated to convey the false impression that such name or business has some connection with, or authorization from, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the United States Housing Authority, the Public Housing Administration, the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, which does not in fact exist, or falsely claims that any repair, improvement, or alteration of any existing structure is required or recommended by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the States Housing Authority, the Public Housing Administration, the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, for the purpose of inducing any person to enter into a contract for the making of such repairs, alterations, or improvements, or falsely advertises or falsely represents by any device whatsoever that any housing unit, project, business, or product has been in any way endorsed, authorized, inspected, appraised, or approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Housing and Home

Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the United States Housing Authority, the Public Housing Administration, the Government of the United States or any Agency thereof; or"

(c) Section 1010 of such Title is amended-

(1) by striking out the caption and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development and Federal Housing Administration transactions";

(2) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(3) by striking out "Administration" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Department"

(d) Section 1012 of such Title is amended-

(1) by striking out the caption and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development transactions";

(2) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(3) by striking out "Administration" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof

"Department".

(e) The analysis of chapter 47, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding

section 1001, is amended-

- (1) by striking out item 1010 and inserting in lieu thereof "1010. Department of Housing and Urban Development and Federal Housing Administration transactions"; and
- (2) by striking out item 1012 and inserting in lieu thereof "1012. Department of Housing and Urban Development transac-

tions". SEC. 226. Title 38, United States Code, is amended-

(a) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" in section 1804(b), (d) and (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(b) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration approved mortgagee designated by the Federal Housing Commissioner" in section 1802(d) and inserting in lieu thereof "mortgagee approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and designated by him".

SEC. 227. Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in the first sentence of the fourth paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Hous-

ing and Urban Development".

SEC. 228. (a) The penultimate sentence of paragraph 7 of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes is amended-

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Administrator" and inserting in Finance lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development":

(2) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof

- Secretary": (3) by striking out "Federal Housing Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and
- (4) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

 (b) Paragraph (11) of section 5200 of the

Revised Statutes is amended-

(1) by striking out "or the Public Housing Administration";

(2) by striking out "or Administration" in both places it appears;

(3) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(4) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof Secretary

Sec. 229. Any function or authority vested in or exercisable by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Chairman thereof, or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation immediately before the enactment of this title shall not by this title or anything therein be affected or impaired, or subjected to any restriction or limitation to which it was not then subject.

The section-by-section summary accompanying Senate bill 2978 is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE HOUS-ING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Section 1. Short title: The bill would be cited as the "Housing and Urban Development Amendments of 1966."

TITLE I-HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

Section 101. FHA-insured property improvement loans: This section would, with respect to loans made or refinanced within permit the insurance premium charged by FHA for a title I property improvement loan to be paid by the borrower.

Section 102. Cooperative housing insurance fund: This section would remove certain technical obstacles to management-type FHA cooperative housing insured mortgages being transferred to a mutual insurance basis. This would thus facilitate use of the authority in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 which authorized such

It would permit mortgagees to use FHA's general insurance fund debentures for paying the mortgage insurance premiums on mortgages covering cooperative housing where the mortgages have been transferred to the cooperative housing mutual fund (management fund). In addition, mort-gagees would be permitted to use any management fund debentures issued in connection with the mortgages transferred to the management fund for the payment of general insurance fund premiums.

Because these changes would remove any basis for objection by mortgagees to a transfer of insurance, a provision in the present law would be removed which requires the consent of a mortgagee before FHA can transfer cooperative housing mortgage insurance to the mutual fund. That is, in some instances, mortgagees have been reluctant to agree to the transfer because it would result in preventing their use of general insurance fund debentures for paying mortgage in-surance premiums after the insurance is The amendments would pertransferred. mit such use of the debentures. In addition, all outstanding insurance on managementtype cooperative housing projects would be authorized to be transferred to the mutual fund.

Section 103. Mortgage limits for homes under section 221(d)(2): This section would increase from \$11,000 to \$12,500 the maximum mortgage amount on a single family dwelling under the FHA home mortgage insurance program for moderate-income and displaced families (sec. 221(d)(2)). The mortgage limit on a two-family residence would be increased from \$18,000 to \$20,000.

These larger mortgage amounts are necessary because of increased housing costs, and the amendment is consistent with a similar change already made by the Congress in section 203(i) of the National Housing Act.

Section 104. Low-rent housing for displaced families-term of lease: This section would permit local housing authorities to lease dwellings without regard to the 1- to 3-year limitation provision contained in the present law, where the housing is needed to rehouse low-income families displaced by governmental action. The leasing program is an important relocation tool because it provides low-rent housing more quickly than new construction, especially for large families.

Families who are forced to relocate by reason of public projects are especially subject to the fear of further forced removals. For such families, relocation into housing which is held under a short-term tenure (such as 3 years) may serve only as a source of further insecurity and of actual hardship. By permitting local housing authorities to lease units for longer terms, where the housing is needed for displaced families, the local authorities will be enabled to make more adequate use of this provision toward meeting the needs of the very families it was pri-

marily designed to help. Section 105. Low-rent housing-use of newly constructed private housing: Prior to the 1965 act public housing could be constructed or acquired only on a long-term (about 40-year) basis because the Federal annual contribution, which is used both for subsidy and to amortize the capital cost through payment of annual debt service on the housing authority bonds, was in terms of a specified percentage of the development or acquisition cost, and this percentage con-templated about 40-year financing. Since the capital cost is substantially less in the case of acquired older housing, and since there is no capital cost in the case of leased privately owned housing, the "flexible formula" amendment was enacted to permit up to the same annual contribution to be paid as would be paid with respect to newly constructed public housing in the area regardless of the size of the capital cost or its nonexistence in the case of leased housing. This change was necessary in order to provide a sufficiently large annual contribution to permit the housing of low-income families in acquired or leased dwellings. This "flexible formula" was added to section 10(c) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 by the 1965

At the same time, the Congress enacted a separate comprehensive section 23 of the United States Housing Act for short-term (1 to 3 years, renewable) leasing of privately owned existing housing. This incorporates the same flexible formula limitation on the maximum amount of annual contribution or annual subsidy that could be provided with respect to such leased dwellings.

Thus, both section 10(c) and section 23 contain flexible formula provisions which permit paying the same annual subsidy with respect to leased or acquired existing housing as would be payable for newly constructed public housing in the community.

This amendment in this section would make it clear that the same flexible formula provisions could be used for the leasing of housing to be constructed as well as for the leasing or acquisition of existing housing. Important additional benefits would be derived from the flexible formula provisions in respect to leasing if they could be applied to proposed privately owned new construction as well as to privately owned existing housing.

This would be particularly true in the very promising prospects of joint ventures between public housing authorities and private owners in creating low- and middleincome developments. Presently such developments of new construction may only be financed under the 40-year standard lowrent financing provisions. These provisions are not suitable for leasing at desirable shorter terms, which are often the only terms available.

Section 106. Applying advances in technology to housing and urban development: This section would establish a program to encourage and assist the housing industry to reduce the cost and improve the quality of housing through the application to home construction and rehabilitation of advances in technology, and to encourage and assist the application of advances in technology to

urban development activities.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would be directed to (1) conduct research and studies to test and demonstrate new and improved techniques, materials, and methods of applying advances in technology to housing construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and urban development activities, and (2) encourage and promote the acceptance and application of the new and improved techniques and methods of constructing, rehabilitating, and maintaining housing, and the application of advances in technology to urban development activities, by all segments of the housing industry, communities, industries engaged in urban development activities, and the general public. Research and studies conducted would be designed to develop and demonstrate the applicability to housing construction, rehabilitation and maintenance, and urban development activities, of advances in technology relating to design concepts, construction and rehabilitation methods, manufacturing processes, materials and products and building components.

Research and study projects could be undertaken either directly by the Secretary or by contract with public or private bodies or agencies, or working agreements with other Federal departments or agencies. Projects would be required to be completed within 2

Provisions of title III of the Housing Act of 1948 and section 602 of the Housing Act of 1956 presently authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to undertake and conduct studies relating to the reduction of housing construction costs through the use of new and improved techniques, materials and methods. However, existing provisions authorize such studies to be undertaken as part of broader research functions such as the collection and dissemination of data relating to market analyses, housing inventories, mortgage market problems, and the housing needs of special groups such as the elderly.

This section recognizes the importance of a program designed specifically to (1) reduce housing costs through application to home construction of technological advances, and (2) assist and encourage the application of advances in technology to urban development activities, by directing the Secretary to undertake such a program and authorizing specific appropriations for that purpose.

Funds necessary to carry out the provisions of the section would be authorized to be

appropriated.

Section 107. Rehabilitation and code enforcement grants: This section would repeal a provision in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966, which limits the amount of urban renewal grant authority that can be used in fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for grants for rehabilitation and code enforcement.

The limitation that would be repealed is inconsistent with the general purpose of the rehabilitation and code enforcement grants. Authority for these grants was added to the Federal urban renewal law by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to encourage more conservation and rehabilitation and thus lessen the need for large-scale slum clearance and redevelopment. The limitation in the appropriation act limiting the total amount of these grants hampers the achievement of this purpose.

Section 108. Mortgage insurance for land development-clarifying amendment: Subsection (a) of this section would correct a technical error in section 1001(c) of the Na-

tional Housing Act.

Subsection (b) would provide clarification regarding the types of improvements that may be covered by mortgages insured by FHA under the land development program (title X of the National Housing Act). The types of improvements permitted under title X are those deemed necessary or desirable to prepare land primarily for residential and re-lated uses or to provide facilities for public or common use. This subsection would make or common use. no substantive change in this regard. It would resolve questions concerning the eligibility of specific types of improvements under title X. The subsection would expressly provide that steam, gas, and electric lines and installations are permissible improvements under title X, and would make it clear that industrial uses are included as related uses. with the industrial sites to be in proper proportion to the size and scope of the develop-

Subsection (c) would add the title X land development mortgage insurance program to the provisions in section 512 of the National Housing Act. That section provides penalties for violations of the act by lenders, borrowers, builders, or others who may receive the benefits of the loan insurance programs. The amendment would include the land development program among those that could not be used by persons subject to the penalties.

Section 109. Repeal of provision for sale of Forest Hills project, Paducah: This section would repeal section 1005 of the Housing Act of 1964, because it cannot be put into effect.

That section directed the sale of an FHAacquired rental housing project in Paducah, Ky., to the Paducah-McCracken County Development Council for use as a dormitory by the Paducah Junior College. The college has received private land donations and does not want the project.

Section 110. Technical amendments: Subsection (a) would repeal a requirement in the Federal urban renewal law that contracts for supplies or services which exceed the amount of \$1,000 may be made or entered into only

after advertising for bids.

The provision that would be repealed is inconsistent with a general Federal statute which imposes the advertising requirement on all Federal contracts of this type which exceed \$2,500 in amount. The repeal of the provision in the urban renewal law would remove this inconsistency.

Subsection (b) would amend provisions in the urban renewal law and the urban planning grant law to make it clear that references in those laws to the Area, Redevelopment Act include also references to laws which are supplementary to that Act. These amendments were inadvertent omissions from the Housing and Urban Development Act of

Subsection (c)—technical.

Subsection (d) would repeal the 1954 prohibition against FNMA's purchasing loans insured or guaranteed prior to August 2, 1954. This provision was appropriate in 1954, as it protected the fledgling Secondary Market Operations from being inundated by offers of existing mortgages. However, it no longer serves this purpose. While repeal of this provision would make eligible for purchase a few mortgages of an age of 12 years and upward which are now not eligible, the number involved is negligible.

Subsection (e)-technical. Subsection (f)—technical.

TITLE II-CONFORMING NOMENCLATURE IN STATUTES TO DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

This title has no legal significance except to correct the wording of certain statutes to conform to existing law as provided in the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act.

The title would make technical amendments in the Federal statutes authorizing the programs of the Department of Housing

and Urban Development and other related Federal laws to make the nomenclature in those laws conform to the provisions of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act. The amendments would make no substantive changes whatsoever in the provisions of the laws.

For example, under the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act, all functions and powers of the Department are vested in the Secretary of the Department. This title of the bill would therefore change the titles Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Public Housing Commissioner, and Federal Housing Commissioner, wherever they appear in the Federal laws, to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Develop-ment. Likewise, the term "Housing and Home Finance Agency" would be changed to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am joining today the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dopp], in sponsoring a joint resolution (S.J. Res. 138) to abolish the electoral college and institute a proportional method of casting electoral

This proposal is substantially similar to other measures which we have introduced individually in the past. However, none of us claims pride of authorship since this is much the same resolution as the so-called Lodge-Gosset amendment, which passed the Senate by an overwhelming margin in 1950, only to die later in the House Rules Committee. I am most gratified that the four of us who have supported the Lodge-Gosset principle over the years have resolved minor differences and can now support the same resolution. I hope this unity will provide the strength to see it passed. for the years which I have devoted to studying this problem have convinced me ours is the best obtainable solution.

Our proposal will accomplish a number of reforms while avoiding the pitfalls inherent in each of the other resolutions

that have been introduced.

First, we would abolish the electoral college which has been a useless appendage to our governmental institutions since the rise of political parties. Legally, the elector still stands where the Constitution placed him: an officer in whom rests the awesome discretion as to who shall lead the most powerful nation in the world. In many States, however, the elector is nothing more or less than the recipient of an empty honor gratefully given for long and faithful service to a political party. But what-ever the qualifications of the electors, few of us now believe that any man or any few hundred men, no matter how wise or faithful, should be entrusted to make our greatest decision. We, therefore, assume that the electors are under a moral obligation to vote for their party's nominees. But ours is a nation of written laws and not of moral imperatives, and the language of the Constitution should be made to conform to what the overwhelming majority of citizens know is correct.

Second, we would also abolish the unitrule system of counting electoral votes. This system, which completely disfranchises those who do not vote for the winner within their State, is indefensible. It requires candidates to concentrate on the large, pivotal States where elections are historically closely contested to the exclusion of smaller States and oneparty States. It encourages the formation of third parties and of bloc voting since a small group can often determine the course of the entire electoral vote of a large State. This is precisely the same unit-rule system which many found invidious in Georgia. I personally feel that Georgians are perfectly capable of deciding what is best for themselves, but it is for us to propose what we think is best for the country. In a case challenging Georgia's unit rule, the courts found that the system was a denial of equal protection of laws. Certainly those who hailed that decision should support this amendment. Since it provides that electoral votes would be cast in proportion to the popular vote in each State, every man would have a voice in the election, and candidates would solicit the vote of every man in every State.

In 1956, the late President Kennedy led the eloquent and successful Senate opposition to an earlier version of this amendment. At that time, he frankly admitted our present system forces candidates to look to the large States in drafting platforms, nominating candidates and running campaigns. It was his thesis that urban interests are justified in having this power because State legislatures and the National House of Representatives were, allegedly, through gerrymandering, far overbalanced in favor of rural interests. Whatever the validity of this argument may have been in 1956, one man, one vote is clearly the law of the land today, and population is the only constitutionally permissible consideration a State may use in drawing districts for either house of its own legislature or for the seats of its congressional delegation. Since the objection that was raised in 1956 is no longer valid. I would trust and hope that those who embraced it then will join us now.

Third, our resolution proposes that if no candidate receives 40 percent of the total electoral votes, the election would be decided by the Senate and House in joint session, with each Senator and Representative having one vote. This would eliminate the undemocratic and unfair method according to which each State delegation-no matter how large or small the State may be-would have one vote in elections thrown into the House. By the reduction of the percentage of electoral votes required for election, we would also reduce the threat of elections being decided by Congress instead of the people and the threat of multiple parties.

Before concluding, Mr. President, I would like to mention three other proposals which have received serious consideration over the years. One of the most appealing, on its face, and the one closest to ours in principle is the direct election approach. Except to say that our amendment has the advantage of

preserving the identity of the States in the presidential electoral process, I will not discuss the merits of direct election because, frankly, I believe there is no chance of ratification. The legislatures of three-fourths of the States are not going to vote away the added advantage of the two additional electoral votes granted them by reason of senatorial representation which benefit the great majority of States.

The district method, by which it is proposed that one electoral vote be given to each congressional district and two to the State at large is preferable to the present system, but it has two defects.

First, gerrymandering—which is in the ancient, if not honorable, American political tradition—could be used to thwart the will of the majority. Second, the votes of those not voting for the winner in a particular district would still not be registered in an election.

The administration has suggested another alternative, one which would abolish the electoral college and change the method of selection when no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes, but one which leaves the unit-rule system intact and untouched. It is this latter inequity—ignored by the administration—which is the most important and whose evils we must face every 4 years. This proposal, if ratified, may never have a bearing on any election. Indeed, it is hardly worth cranking up the complex and protracted amendment process to accomplish so little—it would be almost like chasing a fly with an elephant gun.

Mr. President, it may well be that there is much that can be done to improve our proposal in style, in language, or in procedure. I am convinced, however, that the approach is the soundest and has the best chance of ratification. I hope this is the one which will be reported from the Senate committee back to this body for debate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Reform the Electoral College" from the January 23, 1966, edition of the New York Times be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1966] REFORM THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

President Johnson has made a convincing case for a constitutional amendment to reform the electoral college. Never the independent deliberate body the framers of the Constitution intended, the electoral college developed almost from the beginning into a useless, even dangerous appendix in the body politic.

As recently as 1960, electors in Southern States attempted to exploit their technical right of independence to throw the contest into the House of Representatives. That is the principal difficulty, but Mr. Johnson calls attention to other potentially trouble-some anomalies. If the election were decided in the House, each State would have only one vote, thereby giving Delaware or Vermont as much weight as New York or California. Since the House would choose the President and the Senate would choose the Vice President, the possibility exists that they would be picked from rival parties.

The reform which Mr. Johnson favors would require that the electoral vote of each State be cast automatically for the

candidate who polled the most popular votes in that State. Such a change would improve the existing arrangement, but it would not eliminate the possibility that a candidate who polled a minority of the popular vote throughout the Nation could win because he carried the States which had a majority of the electoral votes. That did happen twice in the 19th century.

in the 19th century.

We believe that Congress should choose between two other proposals. One is the Lodge-Gossett plan which the Senate approved but the House rejected in 1950; it would divide the electoral vote of each State in exact proportion to the popular vote. The other provides for abolition of the electoral vote system entirely, placing the election on a straight population basis. Either of these methods would have the great merit of making certain that the outcome of a presidential election accurately reflected public preference on the one-man, one-vote basis.

In the past the cities helped defeat the Lodge-Gossett plan because it weakened their power in the electoral college; the small States were able to block the other plan because it would weaken theirs. The changes in apportionment, the rise of the suburbs and the increased mobility of the population have rendered these opposing fears obsolete. We think either of these two plans would be preferable to the Johnson proposal, but the latter is certainly preferable to no change at all.

NOTICE OF REPRINTING OF RE-MARKS BY MEMBERS OF CON-GRESS ON UKRAINIAN PROCLA-MATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a private order is being submitted for a reprint publication of all statements made by Senators concerning observance of the 48th anniversary of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence. If any Members of the Senate object to the reprinting of their remarks, kindly contact Mr. Raymond F. Noyes, the Congressional Record clerk. The purpose of this statement is to conform to the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CHANGE IN HEARING ROOM FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPROVE-MENTS IN JUDICIAL MACHINERY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce a change in the hearings on S. 2722. The original announcement of the hearings appeared in the Congressional Record at page 3359, on February 17, 1966. The hearings are still scheduled for March 1, at 11:30 a.m., and March 2, at 9:30 a.m. The hearings on March 1 will be held in room 6226, New Senate Office Building. On March 2 the site of the hearings will be room 6202, New Senate Office Building.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I present for the Record the names of additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2908) to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prevent certain employees of community action agencies and VISTA volunteers from engaging in pernicious political activities.

The names were left off the bill as cosponsors due to a misunderstanding as to the time allowed to obtain them. For that reason, Mr. President, and only for that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be reprinted with the names as cosponsors as indicated on the following list:

S. 2908, introduced by Mr. Murphy (for himself and Mr. Prouty):

COSPONSORS

Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Lausche, Mr Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Scott, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Williams of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2911) to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], for himself and other Senators on February 9, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH subsequently said: Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2911) to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 8, 1966:

S. 2888. A bill to insure that children participating in domestic nonprofit school lunch programs will be assured of adequate supplies of nutritious dairy products: Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hart, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Proxmire.

Authority of February 10, 1966:

S. 2915. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant fellowships for graduate study in highway transportation engineering: Mr. BAYH, Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. METCALE.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Murray, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Udall, Mr. Corbett, and Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina were appointed man-

agers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ST. LOUIS STUDY SHOWS CUT IN SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM HURTS POOREST FIRST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture's plans to cut the special milk program by 80 percent have raised a storm of controversy in this Chamber. Objections to this proposed cutback have been voiced from both sides of the aisle from Senators representing both milk producing and milk consuming States.

Why this massive protest to the administration's plans? The principal reason, Mr. President, is that anyone who takes a clear, realistic look at the administration's proposal realizes that it will hurt, not help, the poor children of our Nation.

Now the administration proposes to limit Federal support for school milk to those children who are designated as needy by a school administrator as well as those schools which do not have a school lunch program. I have already spelled out in some detail the onerous means tests the needy will be forced to pass to qualify for federally subsidized school milk. These tests are currently being used under the school lunch program and administrators find them to be quite unsatisfactory in pinpointing the needy.

Furthermore there is a large gray area of need which simply cannot be reached by a means test. There are parents too proud to accept a Federal handout for their children and thus be singled out as needy. There are parents too unschooled themselves to know how to qualify for free milk for their children. And finally there are parents who may be able to provide milk for their children in school but only at subtantial cost to themselves—parents who just are not willing to make the sacrifice for children who would rather drink soda pop at home than milk in school.

I might say, Mr. President, this involves literally millions and millions of children, because the time when the

burden is greatest on almost any family is when the little children are in school. The mother has to be at home, and cannot be helping supplement the family income.

The sad thing about the administration's proposed cut is that these "gray area poor" will be hurt first and their children will be hardest hit. This is amply illustrated by a study which took place in the St. Louis schools way back in 1954–56. This study was conducted to relate consumption of milk under the school milk program to factors of family income. From the 1954–55 school year to the 1955–56 school year the price of milk was reduced 60 percent from 7½ to 3 cents per half pint. Here is what happened:

Children from low-income families increased their milk consumption by 367 percent. Think of it—an increase in consumption of $3\frac{1}{2}$ times the previous level. Those from middle-income families increased consumption by 133 percent. Even in the middle-income group consumption doubled. Those children from high-income families drank 86 percent more milk—only one-fourth of the increase among the poor.

What does all this mean? It indicates to me beyond a shadow of a doubt that those poor income families that cannot or will not qualify themselves for milk for the needy will be hardest hit by the 30 percent cut in the school milk program.

WAR ON POVERTY GRANT TO MIS-SISSIPPI FOR LARGEST HEAD-START PROGRAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the \$5.6 million war on poverty grant which was announced yesterday to Mississippi for one of the country's largest Headstart programs, will enable more than 9,100 poor children to start their schooling with the same advantages of education, health, and family guidance enjoyed by children from higher income families.

That grant, announced on Tuesday by Sargent Shriver, was awarded to Mary Holmes Junior College for a project to be administered by the Child Development Group of Mississippi. The Child Development Group conducted a Headstart program last summer for more than 6,000 disadvantaged children who are now started on their way to more useful and happier lives. The summer's project was experimental and new, testing an educational program whose methods were untried but whose promise was great. The Office of Economic Opportunity is satisfied that the experiment was a success, that the work of child development for poor families should continue Mississippi.

Last summer's lesson has enabled the OEO, Mary Holmes Junior College, and the Child Development Group to incorporate improvements in the program which will insure that the new effort will be an even greater success than the first. The financial difficulties encountered in the summer will be resolved by more exacting procedures and the assistance of a national and widely respected accounting firm, Ernst and Ernst. New

staff and board members have been brought into the program and new personnel procedures have been adopted to

improve hiring practices.

We will watch this project with particular interest because it is involved with the humane work of erasing the plight of American children. And we can observe the program with special satisfaction because its promises for success are considerable.

Mississippi is providing examples for the entire Nation of what can be done when the resources of a State are united in accelerating the antipoverty effort. In the last 30 days alone, Mississippi has received more than \$14 million in Federal funds for combating the roots and the effects of poverty. This money along with additional Federal funds, will finance sound and imaginative programs to help Mississippi redeem its economic and human potential.

POPULATION CONTROL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the serious problems which has confronted the country in increasing urgency is: Can we achieve a consensus in the country which will make it possible to move forward in the area of population control and the concomitant phase of birth control which deals with the same problem?

There has been concern as to the attitude of the Catholic community toward this problem. From time to time, I have noted on the floor of the Senate what appeared to be a gradual conviction of the Catholic community that population control measures were essential both

at home and abroad.

I was much heartened to note the results of a poll taken by the George Gallup Organization, Inc., on this subject. The results were presented in an article published in the New York Times on Thursday, February 17, under the byline of John W. Finney entitled "Poll Finds Catholics Back Birth Curb Aid."

Mr. President, the statistics are fascinating and I invite the careful attention of the Senate to them. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed

in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL FINDS CATHOLICS BACK BIRTH CURB AID

(By John W. Finney)

Washington, February 16.—Most Americans, including Catholics, favor Federal aid to States, cities, and foreign governments for birth control programs, according to a recent poll.

The survey also shows that most Catholics in the United States believe that the Roman Catholic Church should modify its opposition

to many forms of birth control.

They also believe that birth control information should be easily available to any married person who wants it, the poll found.

The survey into American attitudes on population policy was conducted last fall by the Gallup Organization, Inc., headed by George Gallup. It was taken for the Population Council, a nonprofit foundation that

has been active in promoting population control programs at home and abroad.

The results of the survey, which is believed by population planners to be the most definitive yet conducted on the politically touchy subject of birth control, will be published soon.

The survey was based on a scientific sampling of 3,205 persons. By public opinion survey standards, this was a large cross-section. The Government's monthly unemployment report, for example, is based on a sampling of 3,500 persons.

The number of Catholics polled in the Gallup survey was not given, but in a probability sample such as is used in public opinion surveys, steps are taken to be sure of an adequate cross section of all groups.

The poll may have a considerable political impact; the administration is running into its first political difficulties in its quiet but deliberate move of the last year to extend Federal assistance to birth control programs at home and abroad.

Under a policy laid down by President Johnson a year ago, the Agency for International Development has begun extending assistance to foreign governments for direct support of birth control programs.

This policy has recently been challenged by Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, who represents a district with a large Catholic vote in Milwaukee County.

In letters to AID, Mr. Zablocki has asked whether the agency, in its new policy, was not violating congressional intent. He argued that Congress meant to limit Government assistance to demographic and sociological studies rather than authorize outright support of birth control programs.

In view of Mr. Zablocki's influential position as ranking Democrat on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, his letters have caused considerable concern among AID officials, who were already hesitant about pushing too fast into the politically sensitive area of birth control.

SUPPORT INDICATED

But the main finding to emerge from the poll was that the voters would strongly support any move by the administration to assist State or local governments or foreign countries in birth control programs.

In response to the question "Do you feel that the U.S. Government should give aid to States and cities for birth control programs if they request it?" 63 percent responded "yes," 28 percent "no" and 9 percent "don't know."

To the question "Do you think our Government should help other countries with their birth control programs if they ask us?" 58 percent said "yes," 34 percent "no" and 8 percent "don't know."

Of the 58 percent supporting foreign assistance, 62 percent—or a minority of the total sample—favored going beyond administration policy by furnishing birth control supplies. The present policy is limited to technical and financial assistance for family planning programs.

The church now opposes all chemical or mechanical methods of contraception but does condone the rhythm method in which intercourse is limited to the nonfertile periods of a woman's monthly cycle.

Among the Catholics polled, 56 percent favored a change in the church's policy, compared with 53 percent among non-Catholics, and 33 percent were opposed, compared with 22 percent among non-Catholics. The Catholic support for a change in policy was particularly strong among the younger generation; among those Catholics 60 or older, only 39 percent favored a shift in the church's position.

The poll showed that Catholics as well as non-Catholics were overwhelmingly in support of providing birth control information to married couples.

In response to the question "Do you believe that information about birth control ought to be easily available to any married person who wants it?" 86 percent of the non-Catholics and 81 percent of the Catholics replied "yes."

But a difference developed on the question whether such information should be easily available to any single adult person who wants it. A slight majority of non-Catholics—52 percent—favored such a policy, but it was supported by only 43 percent of the Catholics.

By coincidence, the survey was conducted in two periods immediately before and after Pope Paul VTs visit to the United States last October. In his speech before the United Nations, the Pope appeared to reaffirm the church's position on birth control.

PURPOSE OF THE NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have long been a supporter of the National Teacher Corps and was much disappointed when the Appropriations Committee refused, last year, to fund the National Teacher Corps program as it was recommended by President Johnson and approved by both the Senate and the House.

In the words of President Johnson, the National Teacher Corps "draws on that spirit of dedication of Americans which has been demonstrated time and again in peace and war, by young and old, at home and abroad. It will provide a challenge and an opportunity for teachers with a sense of mission, those best suited to the momentous task this Nation faces in improving education."

The National Teacher Corps will revitalize the education system in low-income areas by attracting dedicated and gifted teachers to serve for 2 years in those places in our Nation where they are needed most. Hopefully, they will continue to serve for many years. The children they teach will have more dedicated educational leadership. The quality of the teaching staffs will be improved. The tenure of the teaching staff can become more stable. The morale of the teaching profession will be strengthened.

In short, there will be quality teachers where quality teaching is most needed.

The Teacher Corps will be set up in a way that provides immediate benefits to local school systems and long-range benefits that will result from the training that Teacher Corps members will receive. Colleges and universities will be given the responsibility for both preservice training and the on-going 2-year training program.

This phase of the National Teacher Corps will benefit not only the corpsmen trained and the schools involved, but will encourage all colleges and universities to broaden their regular teacher-preparation programs to include the kind of training needed for the successful teaching of the children of poverty.

All that is required to set this excellent program in motion is passage of the appropriation bill now before us. I urge the committee to recommend and the Senate to approve the full amount requested by the administration.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR FLEET ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that memorial services for Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz will be held at Washington Cathedral on Friday, February 25, at 2 p.m.

I should also like to mention that I have sent a letter to the Secretary of the Navy urging him to name one of our coming new nuclear-powered carriers in honor of Admiral Nimitz.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
February 24, 1966.

Hon. PAUL H. NITZE, Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the distinguished career and service of Adm. Chester Nimitz, I hope the Navy will give serious consideration to naming one of the coming CVN's (nuclear-powered carriers) in his honor and memory.

I can think of no more fitting memorial to this man who championed seapower, fought constantly for peace, and served his Nation so long and so well.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. TOWER.

BIG SPRING, TEX., YOUTH FOR FREEDOM IN VIETNAM PETITION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Big Spring Youth for Freedom in Vietnam, Big Spring, Tex., recently circulated a petition supporting our policy in Vietnam.

Since this group is representative of many of our young people, I ask unanimous consent to have a newspaper article about their efforts printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Big Spring (Tex.) Herald, Jan. 30, 1966]

YOUNGSTERS FAVORING U.S. VIETNAM POLICY
(By Tom Barry)

The effects of the war in Vietnam can be felt thousands of miles away—by politicians, the electorate, demonstrators pro and con—and in Big Spring, where vibrations have reached into Big Spring High School.

Reaction to the war and its implications recently came from three Big Spring High junior classmen, David Thomas, Larry Arnhart, and Dale Pless. They were discussing these 16-year-olds, Vietnam over the noon meal at the school cafeteria. More particularly, they were discussing draft card burners, beatniks, and the image given by a loud-mouthed minority to the majority of teenagers. These boys felt something should be done.

PETITION PLAN

Others were listening to the discussion. Ten in all decided that the thing to do was to get 500 students to sign petitions saying they, even though nonvoting teenagers, support the present policy of the United States in Vietnam. When signed, the petitions will be sent to Members of Congress.

Forms were printed, permission of school authorities was granted to pass them out and post them on the bulletin board, and by Friday more than the original goal of 500 signatures of students had been obtained.

Also, the group gave itself a name—Big Spring Youth for Freedom in Vietnam.

Five hundred students represent more than one-third of the entire student body of the high school, according to the youthful chairman of the organization, David Thomas.

"We expect more, and will not close our signature drive until Tuesday," he said. "We have had surprisingly little opposition to the drive," he continued. "We've had more trouble with students signing two or more petitions each than with those who refuse to sign."

David said only three students have refused to sign the petition because they favor getting the United States out of Vietnam; and a few more refused to sign because they think the war ought to be accelerated.

Four purposes unite the 10 members of the organization to disavow the draft card burners; to show the adult world how they feel; to encourage representatives in Government; and to support the present policy in Vietnam. Some of the members of the group, like young Thomas, are strongly conservative in their political views; others are on the left side of the fence; and there are some who are middle-of-the-roaders.

After the petitions are signed, they will be divided into three groups of about equal numbers and mailed to Senator John Tower, OMAR BURLESON, representing the 17th District, and George Mahon, formerly representing the 19th District.

"We hope we have a better chance of the petitions having more weight by sending them to the three individuals rather than to President Johnson," Thomas said, "after all, in a few years we'll be the ones fighting in Vietnam if the war goes on, and it is an election year, even though we can't vote yet."

About 12 teachers are helping the group in one way or another, Thomas said, putting petitions up in classrooms and passing them around in government classes.

Will the petitions do any good?

"Well," Thomas said, "let's say our hopes are moderate."

"We thought we should do something,"
Thomas said. "We are hardly the type to
demonstrate in the streets, and we know that
petitions don't normally get a lot of results,
but we wanted to speak our piece."

The vigor with which the 10 members of the organization are presenting their case for the majority of teenagers (already several teachers have announced open support of the campaign, according to Thomas) indicates that something beyond ignoring the normally quiet, "average" teenager, should result.

THE IMPORTANCE OF WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Miss Kathy Allen, an outstanding student of Dumas High School, in Texas, has written an excellent essay about the importance of water conservation. This is a most perceptive article.

Since the matter of water conservation is of vital importance to us all, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record. There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the North Plains Water News]
Why Is Water Conservation Called Vital?
WE CAN'T LIVE WITHOUT IT

WHY THE IMPORTANCE OF WATER CONSERVATION?

(By Kathy Allen, Dumas High School) (Note.—Kathy Allen, 18-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Orval Allen, 1203 NE. 4th in

Dumas, is the author of the essay printed in this issue of the North Plains Water News.

(Kathy is a graduate of Dumas High School, class of 1965. She was salutatorian of her class, finalist in the National Merit Scholarship Contest, State winner in one-act playwriting, district winner American Legion Oratorical Contest. She was active in speech, drama, math, debate, and National Honor Society. At the present time Kathy is a

joring in speech and math.

(We are proud of Kathy's essay for two reasons. First, we thought it was an outstanding essay and, second, she is the daughter of our field representative, Orval Allen.)

student at West Texas State University, ma-

All of the greatest and most complex reasons why we should be concerned about water can be summed up in one statement. We could not live without it. We could work for years listing the uses we have for water and still not have listed all of them. Almost every human activity on earth involves water to some degree. Scientists concerned with space travel immediately rule out the possibility of inhabiting any planet which does not show signs of the existence of water. Water is just this important to us. Although we cannot list every use we make of water, we can give some general uses. In this way, we can begin to realize how much we depend on water.

We are mainly concerned with water for our personal use. We drink it and, due to Nature's mystery, we would die without it. We use it in our cooking. It keeps us clean, and we use it to clean our clothes, houses, and other belongings. This explains why settlers first considered a water supply when establishing a settlement. And as more and more people crowded into cities, and as modern appliances have been invented, our rate of personal use of water has steadily increased.

Industries use tons of water every day. For example, it is estimated that it takes 70,000 gallons of water to produce 1 ton of paper. These industries use water in other ways, too. It is used to carry away waste, and it is used in their research laboratories.

Americans have made extensive use of our water resources for recreational purposes. Boating and water skiing are two sports which are enjoying ever-increasing popularity. Almost every town has its municipal swimming pool, and pools are finding their ways to more and more back yards. Skindiving, a comparatively new sport is also catching on. Surfing and fishing are equally popular. Thus, we can see that water plays an important part in our recreational activities.

These are only a fraction of the uses we have for water. Rivers are also used for transportation. Water is used to generate electricity, and anyone who has seen Niagara Falls can testify that water in the form of falls, rushing streams, or glistening lakes provides some beautiful scenery.

Now that we have a look at the importance of water to us, we can better realize that we should be concerned about our sources of water. However, one additional fact should make our interest more acute. We are fast depleting our water supply. To get a clearer understanding of just how we are losing water, we must understand the water cycle.

In nature, there is a continuous movement of water called the water cycle. As we know, all water runs downhill. Thus the majority of our water runs to the sea. This includes rivers and our water table. The other small percent runs into lakes or basins. If water remained here, we would have lost all of our water by now. But water does not stay there. The water in the oceans or lakes evaporates and is carried by air masses back over the land. As these air masses cool, the water vapor falls as rain, snow, or some other precipitation. This water again drains to lakes or to the seas, and the cycle continues.

A quick look at this cycle will tell us that we must catch this water between the time it falls as rain and the time it returns to the seas. Some regions, of course, receive more precipitation than others. This can easily be explained by the fact that air masses move from west to east. Laden with moisture, they rise over mountain ranges. As they cool, the moisture condenses and falls as rain, snow, or some other form of precipitation. By the time these air masses reach areas such as ours, they have lost the significant portion of the moisture they started with. Nature alone, of course, does not suffer, but when people crowd into these areas, make use of modern dishwashers and other conveniences, and draw gallons of water from the land for irrigation, a serious problem develops. Water problems are not limited to our area, either. As the water sources in other areas become unfit for use due to waste, dumping, or the like, these people, too, have a problem.

The evidence is clear and unmistakable. We cannot do without it, and yet, we are depleting our supply steadily each day. Let's consider the inevitable outcome of our failure to act. Picture with me a nation in the future. What was once fertile plains is now a barren desert. People can no longer live here. They are crowded around the Nation's few remaining water sources. The Nation's

economy is at a standstill.

Perhaps this picture seems entirely unreal. You might think that such a thing is not at all possible. If so, you join the large group of Americans who are ignorant of the necessity of water conservation. These people need to wake up to the fact that our valuable water resources must be handled

Our situation at present is by no means hopeless. There is still time if we act now. Evidence of what can be done is the progress that has already been made. Industries, realizing the problem, have done extensive research on the treatment of waste. Experiments have been carried out in which chemicals were sprayed on shallow ponds to prevent evaporation. In some instances, these shallow ponds were made deeper to reduce the surface area. Experiments have been carried out to induce rain. Dams have been built to catch water and put it to better use. As slow as progress has been, it is still a step in the right direction.

Much remains to be done. The biggest and most important task ahead is the education of the American people. No water conservation project can be successful without the understanding and support of the people. A start has been made in our schools, but this is not enough. The welfare of our people, the economy of our Nation, and our very existence depend on a resource that we are wasting. Although the serious problem is not immediate, we cannot risk a delay in We must begin now to insure conservation of a priceless resource-water.

OUR MONETARY POLICY IN A PROSPEROUS ECONOMY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Mr. Charles N. Shepardson, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, delivered some very excellent remarks entitled "Monetary Policy in a Prosperous Economy," at the 73d annual convention of the Mountain States Lumber Dealers Association.

I ask unanimous consent to have these remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONETARY POLICY IN A PROSPEROUS ECONOMY (By Charles N. Shepardson, member of the

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System at the 73d annual convention of the Mountain States Lumber Dealers Association, Denver, Colo., January 29, 1966)

It is always a pleasure to come home. And today I come home again to Colorado.

But I must admit that pleasure is mixed with a little apprehension, apprehension in speaking to an industrial group like yours. If I'm an expert on anything, it's agriculture, not industry. And to compound my apprehension, today I'm not going to talk about either industry or agriculture. Rather I'm going to talk about the developing economic prosperity that we've been experiencing here in the United States for the last few years, and the problems it's beginning to pose for us, particularly those of us in the Federal Reserve System who have the responsibility of administering monetary policy.

A GLANCE BACKWARD

The economic scene: 1965 was a year in which we were bigger and better than ever according to most all of the broad indicators we use to measure our economy's performance. Industrial production grew 8 percent. The dollar value of our total national product increased 7½ percent. And all this came after 4 previous years of steady and substantial economic growth.

Employment in 1965 was the highest in years. We also made at least some progress toward solving our serious balance-of-pay-

ments problem.

Business and consumer confidence remained high. Businesses spent 15 percent more on new plants and equipment than they did in 1964, and they plan another large increase this year. As total income rose, consumer expenditures for autos, other durable goods, services, and even nondurable goods-for just about everything except houses-also rose sharply, even though they saved about the same share of income as in other recent years.

So-with almost everybody working, making higher incomes than ever, saving and spending unprecedented amounts, and confident about the future-what in the world was there to worry about?

One thing to worry about was that there were signs of imbalance and threats of unsustainability in the expansion developing. In an economy as diverse as ours, pressures and imbalances can exist in critical areas long before they show up in the overall statistics. In fact, by the time they do show up there, it may be too late to do very much about them. Ours is a very adaptable economy, but sometimes we are too sanguine about the insignificance of problems, so long they remain selective and the overall picture continues to look good.

There was increasing evidence, as 1965 progressed, that at the high average rate at which human and national resources were being utilized, some critical resources were being badly strained. During the year we effected a further reduction in our unemployment rate, which had been too high for too long. We finally got close to the administration's interim target of 4 percent. But serious shortages of some kinds of skilled workers were developing even though among some groups of our people there continued

to be altogether too many who could not find jobs.

By December, the overall jobless rate was down to 4.1 percent—the lowest since May 1957. In such Great Lakes industrial centers as Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Cincinnati, and Cleveland, unemployment rates went below 2½ percent. There, with virtually the only workers idle those moving from one job to another, the supply of labor was really tight. Around the country, factories were pressed for skilled workers such as tool and die makers, machinists, and sheet metal workers, and overtime for factory workers was the highest in the 10 years that records have been kept.

These scattered but critical labor shortages did not develop overnight. Manufacturers were operating at an average rate of 90 percent of capacity throughout the year and the rate in some industries was well over 90 percent. At such high levels of operations, labor shortages develop, overtime becomes necessary, older and less efficient plant is into operation, costs rise, and

productivity declines.

There are also consequences elsewhere from the kinds of strain that develop when labor and capacity are inadequate for the demands put on them. As operating costs rise, businesses feel justified in raising their prices and, as you know, some have done so. Moreover, as availability of certain skills becomes more crucial to meeting the demands of customers, labor feels justified in demanding more generous wage settlements and, after 4 years of wage increases that kept pace with rising productivity, some settlements last year exceeded the administration's guideposts.

Eventually, training of new workers and additional investment in plant and equipment will ease the strains on our physical resources, but they don't help much over the short-run. In fact, the step-up in business capital expenditures last year, with all the demands it created for steel, machine tools, and the other labor and materials that go into new plants added significantly to the

pressure on existing resources.

The kinds of pressures that developed last year had not been expected at the start of the year. In addition to the stepped-up pace of Government spending, private demands for goods and services turned out to be surprisingly large. There was a great flurry of activity early in the year which was expected to be temporary, since it reflected both the aftermath of the auto strikes in late 1964 and efforts of steel-using businesses to build up inventories in advance of an expected steel strike. But consumers continued to purchase autos and other consumer goods in record volume and, though businesses stopped spending quite so much for inventories, they began to spend more and more for new plants and machinery. Every time the Government asked them about their capital expenditure plans, the total planned for 1965 came out larger. It now appears that they spent \$2 billion more for plant and equipment last year than they had been expected to at the start of the year-and the final figures aren't

The financial scene: So far I have been talking about the squeeze on resources of and productive capacity. labor resources were also under increasing pressure last year. Both consumers and businesses increased their spending at a faster rate than their incomes were rising. were able to do so only by relying heavily on borrowed funds. Debt expansion was substantial in 1965, so substantial as to raise serious doubts as to whether it was either sound or sustainable.

Consumer credit and business borrowing at banks accounted for the largest part of the increased credit flows, and did so right from the start of the year. Business loans at banks, for example, grew at an annual

rate of 26 percent in the first quarter of 1965. This extraordinary increase reflected not just the financing required to rebuild dealers' stocks of autos and the accumulation of steel inventories, but also the funds needed by exporters and importers to hold inventories they could not move during the dock strike. It also included a very heavy volume of lending to foreign businesses, partly connected with earlier commitments. Things were expected to calm down once the auto and steel inventory buildups were com-pleted, the dock strike was settled, and the President's February balance-of-payments program was underway.

But they didn't calm down. Businesses continued to borrow rather large amounts from banks, though less than in the early part of the year and less to finance their foreign activities. Financing in the security markets also increased sharply. Credit flows to business corporations over last year as a whole were nearly 50 percent larger than they were the year before. Internal funds available to them from undistributed profits and depreciation allowances, on the other

hand, rose only 12 percent.

Rapid expansion of debt such as occurred last year tends to create two kinds of imbalances, both of considerable concern to us. It almost goes without saying, of course, that an expanding economy requires and can handle increasing amounts of debt, and we could hardly have sound and sustainable economic growth without a steady flow of appropriate amounts of debt. But as debt continues to mount in the economy as a whole, and especially as it appears to be financing an exceptionally large proportion of total spending, one begins to suspect that some businesses and consumers are taking on more debt than they can handle, that the quality of credit is declining, and that debt burdens for some are becoming dangerously high. One begins to worry about what happens to spending when, after this debtfinanced binge, the debt must be repaid.

Sustainable growth in our economy requires that we not try to do too much at once. Excessive borrowing to support spending on goods and services that are in short supply is most likely both to add dangerously to wage and price pressures at the time and to require a sharp cutback in spending while the debts are worked off—the boom and bust we all want to avoid. This is one kind of imbalance that threatens the health of the economy through its effect on the financial position of borrowers and their spending

A second imbalance—which is simply the other side of the same coin as excessive debt expansion-was the imbalance that arose in credit markets because demands for credit were running ahead of the supply of saving. The situation last year was compounded by several factors. The increased expansion in credit occurred at a time when there was virtually no increase in the total volume of funds flowing to savings institutions. Also, business corporations were so pressed for liquidity that they found it difficult to provide funds to others by adding to their holdings of bank deposits, U.S. Government securities, finance company paper, and other short-term securities. The surge in demand for a limited supply of investment funds resulted both in sharp increases in market interest rates-that is, in those rates that were free to move up-and very heavy demands on commercial banks.

Throughout the expansion period, the Federal Reserve has acted to supply banks with enough reserves to accommodate the needs of a growing domestic economy but hopefully not so much as to promote excessive and inflationary use of credit at home or to contribute to a worsening balance-of-payments situation internationally. For 4 years, this relatively easy monetary policy, together

with expanding flows of savings, permitted substantial credit growth at interest rates that remained below their recent earlier high that occurred in 1960. But as 1965 progressed, provision of enough reserves to support a strong rise in the money supply was still not enough to prevent market rates of

interest from rising considerably.

It became increasingly clear that an excessively large volume of bank reserves would have been needed to have halted the unward pressure on interest rates and to have reversed the trends that had carried money market rates above the discount rate and pushed time deposit rates against their ceilings. There was also growing evidence that heavy demands for credit were likely to be with us for some time to come. This increased the inflationary risks of coping with the situation through a large additional increase in bank reserves.

The problem as it related to bank credit expansion was that banks, faced with heavy demands for credit, were handicapped by the existing maximum ceilings payable on time deposits in their efforts to compete for such deposits.

The most appropriate solution to this situation appeared to us to be threefold: (1) To continue to supply a reasonable amount of bank reserves through open market purchases of Government securities; (2) to increase the discount rate, both to bring it into line with money market rates and indirectly to moderate the expansion of bank credit and money through increasing the cost of borrowed bank reserves; and (3) to raise the permissible maximum rate on time deposits so that banks would be better able to compete for money market funds needed to enable them to meet their large loan demands.

The threefold approach to reducing the distortion in credit markets recognizes the appropriateness of higher interest rates as a deterrent to excessive credit expansion in an economy that has absorbed most of its previous slack. The intent is not to cut off the expansion, but simply to keep it from accelerating to an unsustainable pace-to encourage both borrowers and lenders to examine proposed debt-financed expenditures a little more carefully and to screen and postpone some marginal projects.

In the 8 weeks since these actions were taken, new information that has become available has confirmed our judgment of the underlying situation. I am thinking here of the large upward revision in business plant and equipment expenditures in the last half of last year and in planned spending in the first half of 1966. There has also been a significant upward revision in the estimates of gross national product for the first three quarters of 1965 and a consequent raising of sights for the fourth quarter and the year ahead. In December, industrial production, personal incomes, wholesale prices, housing starts, new orders for durable goods, bank credit, and the money supply all showed sharp increases. And on top of all this came the need for greater military expenditures to finance the fighting in Vietnam.

A LOOK AHEAD

All these pieces of additional information suggest that the pressures on resources-human, material, and financial-that were developing last year could be even more intense this year. Price pressures and labor shortages are likely to increase with further expansion in activity and increased transfer of manpower to the needs of our military effort. Business demands for credit, which accounted for much of the increased credit expansion in 1965, are likely to remain very large. In addition to the big planned increase in plant and equipment expenditures. spending for inventories is likely to rise now that liquidation of steel inventories is about completed, and corporate profits, which benefited from a tax cut last year, may not rise much further this year.

Our balance-of-payments problem is still not solved. Though we have made some welcome progress toward equilibrium, we have a way to go yet. The last billion and a half of the deficit may be the hardest to eliminate. There is no easy way to improve the situation further, given our commitments to spend heavily for defense abroad, except to request financial institutions and nonfinancial corporations to continue to curtail, for the time being, their foreign lending and

Military expenditures which were already accelerating last year are, as we all know, going to be even larger over the remainder of this fiscal year and are currently expected to be even larger in fiscal 1967. In the happy event that peace breaks out in Vietnam and such heavy military expenditures prove to be unnecessary, an intensification of the war on and increased outlays for other needed domestic programs can be expected.

It is quite impossible to say what changes in monetary policy may be required from here on. Such changes will depend on many things—particularly on the full effects, which are as yet unknown, of the actions we have already taken, and on the Federal Government's fiscal and debt management policies. In the area of fiscal policy, the President's recent messages indicate that, although a large increase in spending planned, a large increase in revenues is also expected—partly because of the continued rise in incomes and partly because of plans for an acceleration in the timing of receipts, which it is hoped will moderate not only Federal borrowing but also private spending.

Thus, it remains to be seen in what degree, and even in what direction, monetary policy may need to move in order best to promote the sustained and healthy growth of our economy. Monetary policy is a flexible instrument, and I can assure you we will be using it to the best of our ability to help bring about a continuation of a sound and sustainable economic expansion.

CONCLUSION

Now, in conclusion, what does all this mean to your business? What does it mean for construction and real estate finance?

You will note that it was the discount rate and maximum rates payable by commercial banks on time deposits that were raised in December. The ceiling rate on passbook savings was not raised. In the first place, such savings are in practice available on demand and, therefore, do not warrant as high an interest rate as time deposits with fixed maturities. Also, we did not want to disrupt the usual flow of individual saving to the variety of financial institutions and savings instruments.

Our actions raising time deposit ceiling rates are but another step in a series we have been taking in recent years to improve the functioning of financial markets. For a long time commercial banks were at a disadvantage relative to other financial institutions in competing for savings and money market funds. That disadvantage is being reduced, not by curbing other institutions but by eliminating unnecessary limitations on the banks. Hopefully, the end result will be freer and fuller functioning money and capi-

Evidence we have received to date suggests that banks have been using ther new found freedom in competing for funds wisely. There has been no great rush to raise rates or to compete too aggressively for funds.

Moreover, there has been no great shifting of savings among various institutions. Com-mercial bank time and savings deposits, in fact, have risen less sharply since the change in Regulation Q ceilings than they did before. And flows of funds to other savings institutions have not been greatly affected.

Having said all this, although we expect a continued ample flow of funds into mortgages and residential construction this year, that flow will no doubt be dampened by our recent actions. But this, it seems to me, is warranted by the likely overall economic situation and, indeed, by the construction industry itself.

I have been struck by the fact that we have been experiencing inflation in your industry for some years. Land values, construction wages, and construction costs in general have risen steadily and substantially. With the general economy likely to be under increased wage and price pressures this year, it is appropriate for some moderate additional restraint to be put on construction activity if disrupting price and wage pressures are to be prevented.

The longer run needs of the economy for houses and construction of all kinds are very large. We want to do all in our power—both you in the industry and we in Government—to keep activity growing, but on a sound and

sustainable basis.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] for placing in the Record a statement of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] relative to the water resources development of this Nation of ours. Specifically, I was attracted by a statement that the Senator from Florida made relative to the criteria that the Corps of Engineers is now using in connection with the justification of navigation projects. To be sure that no Senators miss this important statement, I should like to repeat a few paragraphs from the statement of the Senator from Florida:

You are all familiar with the efforts of the Corps of Engineers, and I say this in all candor as I know the engineers must take policy guidance from the Bureau of the Budget, to improve their methods of evaluating navigation benefits in carrying out the instructions issued by the Chief of Engineers under date of November 20, 1964, subject: "Waterway Improvement Studies—Navigation Benefits."

Most of you are aware of the method that has been used in the past to calculate the so-called cost-benefit ratio of a project. Under the old and proven method, a survey of the resources of an area would be made to determine the products and tonnage that would be generated to move on a waterway, and the difference in the rate between the existing freight rate and the barge rate would be the savings attributable to the project. If the total of these annual benefits exceeded the annual total costs, including amortization and operation and maintenance, the project had a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio and was considered feasible; and the higher the ratio, the more desirable the project, therefore placing the project in an excellent position for congressional approval.

Now comes the new criteria as prescribed by the Bureau of the Budget policy. In essence, the proposal would compare the barge rate with a theoretical rate that the competing modes of transportation might be compelled to adopt if a waterway were placed in operation. Of course, such a thing as this would tend to greatly reduce the benefits and frequently result in an unfavorable report.

Should the competing forms of transportation place such theoretical rates into permanent effect there could be no argument, but they are not required to do so nor do they anticipate doing so.

The new directive provides:

"The traffic that would move over a considered waterway improvement will depend on the competitive rates by barge and alternative means that would likely be in effect with the waterway improvement. Therefore, estimates of waterway traffic will be prepared on the basis of projected 'water compelled' rates with consideration of all data and factors that are likely to modify current rates to take account of the competitive situation anticipated with the waterway in-being, and foreseeable technological developments applicable to the several transport media.

"The benefits for the traffic (estimated as in above) that would move over an improved waterway will be computed as the difference in the projected competitive rates or charges for the movement by the alternative means that would be used in the absence of the waterway and the projected rates and charges utilizing the waterway. In developing the projected rates or charges, consideration will be given to all pertinent data and factors, including the competitive situation in the absence of the waterway, current rates, and foreseeable technological developments applicable to the several transport The benefits determined in this manner will be used in project justification and in the benefit-cost ratio.
"In addition, reports will include an esti-

"In addition, reports will include an estimate of benefits obtained by applying unit savings based on the rates prevailing at the time of the study to the waterway traffic also estimated on the basis of rates prevail-

ing at the time of the study."

Based on this criteria, which seems absurd to me, a railroad might very easily fix rates in an area of a proposed project to discourage waterway traffic and thereafter raise the rates to the original level. Therefore, if on the basis of projected water compelled rates the benefits from an otherwise justifiable navigation project can be so depressed as to result in its rejection by the Engineers, the railroads can practically control the development of our inland waterways for navigation purpose by simply projecting totally unrealistic rates.

The new directive is so ambiguous that few engineers can agree on its interpretation and to me it seems to be a shortsighted policy to insist on criteria which would tend to perpetuate a static or "no growth" climate for industrial development by continuing high transportation rates that the project

would materially reduce.

Incidentally, it is my understanding that no new projects have been approved under the new criteria, that is, since November, 1964, and that a review of many approved projects—with which we are in complete accord as being feasible and justified—under the new criteria would find them wanting for lack of a favorable cost-benefit ratio.

I am glad to associate myself with the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Louisiana, and many other Senators, in connection with the forthright statement which the Senator from Florida has made.

On January 14, Representative JIM WRIGHT, an outstanding Member of the House, addressed the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce. He, too, pointed out the fallacy of the formula that is now being forced upon good navigation projects. Representative WRIGHT said in part:

During the past decade, your State has led the Nation in the development and conservation of your water supply. My hat is off to the citizens of Oklahoma City and of the western part of this State who have inspired the Nation with their display of statesmanship and vision in so actively supporting the Arkansas River project, even though

thus far its tangible benefits have extended only to the eastern section of your State.

And, despite the initial disappointment which all of us have felt over the somewhat negative report of the board of engineers for rivers and harbors, with men like Mike Moneoney, Fred Harris, and Ededing the Still and resource-fulness and persuasion for which they are known, I firmly predict that no amount of obstruction will be able to hold back indefinitely the coming reality of the central Oklahoma project.

As one Congressman from a neighboring State, I pledge to you that—as long as I have the privilege to serve on the Public Works Committee—this practical and necessary development will have my hand and my heart, my voice and my vote, and whatever

help that I can give.

The time is rapidly coming in the United States when that area blessed with a maximum development of its water resources will be better off by far than if it had oil or gold or uranium, or any other resource of the earth, but lacked water. I have never heard a more ridiculous or more specious argument than that forced upon the Corps of Engineers by the Bureau of the Budget that a better set of freight rates through other modes of transportation, brought about by a navigation project, should be considered as a cost rather than a benefit factor.

It is obvious that the better rates will not come unless the canal is built. And if they should come as its competitive result, then I can't count that as anything but an addi-

tional benefit to the people.

Development of our waterways was one of the first functions of government recognized by the Congress in the 1st decade of the 19th century. But the history of their development has been a history of thinking too small and acting too slowly. Not Oklahoma alone, but the Nation, will

Not Oklahoma alone, but the Nation, will benefit by the central Oklahoma project. The best homiletic I have ever read on the subject was delivered on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1848 by a young Congressman named Abraham Lincoln. He was speaking out against a Presidential veto of an omnibus public works measure.

Lincoln demonstrated through the flawless logic that came to be his hallmark that, because of an inland waterway in remote Illinois, the sugar merchant in New Orleans sold his wares a "little dearer" and the housewife in Buffalo, N.Y., sugared her husband's coffee a "little cheaper."

The history of that splendid professional group known as the Corps of Army Engineers has been a history of cautious calculations and conservative estimates to tonnages.

The Engineers' projection on the Mississippi waterway was 9 million tons a year. In 1963, it carried almost 40 million tons—or 344 percent of the estimated volume.

The Engineers projected 9 million tons a year for the Ohio waterway. In 1963, it was carrying 88 million tons, or almost 9 times the estimated amount, and the locks were having to be rebuilt to accommodate the burgeoning volume of usage.

The original estimate, just a very few years ago, for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between New Orleans and Corpus Christi was only 7 million tons a year. That canal last year exceeded the official estimates by more than 10 times.

But the value of water resource development cannot be written in tonnages alone. The great complex of industrial development in the United States has grown up primarily along our inland waterways system, and from this the Nation has benefited beyond measure.

Last year, some 300 new industries sprang up along the banks of our Nation's navigable streams. This development not only creates a tax base for the local communities, it provides the payroll which generates other economic activities ad infinitum. In context with all we have been discussing, this may be far more important for the future than we realize.

Mr. President, the central Oklahoma project, an extension of navigation from the Arkansas River to the vicinity of Oklahoma City, has recently undergone emasculation due to the application of this formula. Although the district engineer and the division engineer recommended to the chief of engineers the authorization of the central Oklahoma project, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, after reviewing the project and applying the new formula, recommended deferment of navigation until a demonstration of its worth could be made. We had been told repeatedly that the central Oklahoma project was one of the best, if not the best, of the navigation projects the corps had before it for consideration.

It is my understanding that this new criteria will result in no more navigation projects being built in the United States until the Congress or the executive agencies of this Government determine that the developing of the water resources of this country is of such importance to our growth and economy that they will return to the criteria which built the inland waterways of the country and provided the basis for billions of dollars of new industry along these waterways.

Mr. President, I join with others of this body in resisting a policy that is a detriment to the development of our country.

VIETNAM—PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH OF LAST NIGHT AND VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S RECENT TRIP TO THE FAR EAST

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it was my privilege to hear the television broadcast of the President's speech last night. He spoke the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the American people in support of our Nation's position and in support of our men who are fighting in Vietnam at this yery hour.

This morning it was my privilege, along with other Senators, to hear the Vice President speak about his trip to the Far East—Vietnam and other nations in that area—and his discussions with heads of governments there. In my opinion, that was one of the most eloquent and impressive statements which this Senator has had the privilege of hearing in a great number of years.

It is my hope that in due course the Vice President, while eliminating from his statement items that are necessarily confidential and secret, will make available to the American people information about his experiences and his conclusions as the result of his trip to that area.

Our Vice President exposed himself to considerable danger in order to visit our men on the battlefield, and in order to discuss with many leaders of foreign nations the desirability of stepping up aid they are giving this Nation, and also the desirability of working together toward social and economic reforms.

It would be best for the Vice President to speak for himself in these matters.

Any Senator did not hear the Vice President this morning would be well advised to seek the opinion of the Vice President and let him explain what were his experiences and what his conclusions were.

Senators, of course, are privileged to know a great deal of secret information that the Vice President would not be privileged to give to the Nation as a whole.

One fortunate thing about our Vice President is that he is not inarticulate. He is very well able to explain his views and get across his ideas, even though some of the information he might like to marshal on which his conclusions are based might be of such secret or confidential nature that it cannot be made available generally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I repeat, as one who was fortunate enough to hear the Vice President this morning, I was extremely impressed. I hope all Senators who, for one reason or another, did not have occasion to hear him will have occasion to speak with him.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business and take up certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

George A. Avery, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia; and

Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, U.S. Army, and Paul L. Sitton, of the District of Columbia, to be members of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Irma V. Bouton, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we pass all matters on the Executive Calendar and start with the nomination of Lee C. White to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lee C. White, of Nebraska, to be

a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be considered; and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read routine nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Environmental Science Services Administration and in the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and they are confirmed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR MCNAMARA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today I wish to add my own personal comments to those of my colleagues who have recited the accomplishments of retiring Senator PAT McNAMARA.

Since I came to the Senate 4 years ago I have had the distinct personal privilege of serving on the Public Works Committee with the distinguished Michigan Senator as chairman. Our committee has made considerable progress in the last 4 years, and I wish to echo the comments of other Senators when I say that Pat McNamara's leadership and guidance will be missed. His 12 years of dedicated and progressive service to the Nation shall never be forgotten.

RENT SUBSIDIES

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on February 6, the Arizona Republic in Phoenix—the largest daily newspaper published in my State—published a thoughtful and well-reasoned editorial on some of the dangers inherent in a program of rent subsidies. I believe this editorial deserves a wider audience and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, Feb. 6, 1966] RENT SUBSIDY PLAN

One of the more controversial Great Society proposals is that of rent subsidies for those who do not otherwise qualify for public housing.

Last year Congress approved such a plan, but then the legislators refused to vote the necessary funds, charging that eligibility rules were so vague that persons who were not poor would qualify for subsidies. Where-upon L.B.J. came right back this year, asking for \$30 million for rent subsidies in the fiscal year ending June 30, and requesting that the yearly payments be increased over 4 years to an annual rate of \$150 million.

Under the plan, tenants would pay a quarter of their wages for rent, the Federal Government would subsidize the remainder. If the family's income increases, the rent subsidy will be reduced proportionately. Unlike public housing, which requires families to move after their income reaches a certain level, these families can continue living in their apartments whatever their income level, although they will not qualify for a subsidy if their income exceeds a specified ceiling.

Few would deny the need for rich America to provide adequate housing for its impoverished. And perhaps the rent subsidy plan will succeed where public housing, for all its good intentions, has not. But we would hope that Congress examines the proposal with a cold eye, to insure that it does not become a carrot for politicians to dangle before voters.

If such a possibility seems farfetched, we need only point to the experience of rent controls, which clearly were used as political bait to curry votes at the expense of a relatively small minority (i.e., the house and apartment owner).

In an incisive recent book, "Welfare, Freedom, and Inflation," world-famed economist

Wilhelm Ropke noted:

"We have reached a stage when, to many people, it sounds strange when we ask the question why the earlier rule no longer holds good; that anyone who can afford to buy his suit out of his own pocket at the economic price, should also pay an economic price for his lodging.

"How does it come about that an otherwise perfectly reasonable citizen, who would be ashamed to let anybody else pay for his refrigerator, his motorcycle, or his lunch, has come to look on it as his unassailable right to shift part of the burden of the economic cost of his lodging onto someone else's shoulders?"

Professor Ropke was not, of course, referring to the truly poor, those whose impoverished condition puts them at the mercy of the state. He meant those greedy citizens who agitate for handouts or subsidies because they believe, or choose to believe, that nobody pays for anything that comes from the Government—that a handout or a subsidy is "free."

By all means, Congress should make provisions for those who genuinely need housing assistance. But it must take pains to exclude from the Government watering trough those who merely have their hands out in hope of something for nothing.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, 48 years ago on February 16, the people of Lithuania declared their independence. Latvia and Estonia also proclaimed their independence the same year. In the two decades of freedom that they enjoyed great progress was made. Agrarian reform was brought about, culture flourished, foreign trade was expanded, stable currency was introduced and other needed social reforms occurred. In short, the outlook for these small nations was bright. Independence and freedom, unfortunately, were too short-lived, for in 1940, these small Baltic States were ruthlessly overrun by Soviet aggression. In addition to exercising totalitarian political control, the Soviet Union has exploited the economic resources, stiffled cultural development and has attempted to substitute athestic communistic ceremonies for the deeply religious feelings of these brave people in the Baltic States.

Naturally, Mr. President, the sons and daughters of these captive nations who immigrated to the United States vigorously reacted to the destruction of freedom in their former native lands. Descendants of the peoples of the Baltic States continue to point out to the world this oppression under Soviet rule. All Americans resent the subjugation of these small nations. The policy of our Government reflects these sentiments, for our Government fails to recognize the cruel annexation of the small countries by the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I know free people everywhere join me today in hoping that the 25 years of enslavement of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian people will someday be ended and that these small countries together with all the nations of the world will be able to determine for themselves their own destiny.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TO LEGISLATIVE BODIES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, last November when the Interparliamentary Union Conference met in Geneva, Switzerland, which I attended as president of the U.S. delegation, a most interesting and informative address was delivered to the group by Edward Wenk, Jr., of the Library of Congress on the increasing importance of science and technology to legislative bodies in the world today.

Mr. Wenk made a scholarly and informative presentation, and I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMATION REQUIRED BY PARLIAMENTS IN A WORLD INCREASINGLY DEPENDENT UPON SCI-

(An address before the Interparliamentary Union Conference, Geneva, Switzerland, Nov. 5, 1965, by Edward Wenk, Jr., Chief, Science Policy Research Division. Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, ladies and gentlemen, it is a very great privilege to have been invited to participate in this symposium of the Interparliamentary Union. And it is all the more an honor to represent the scientific community at this auspicious dedication of the Union's new home.

The long history and high purpose of this body in seeking world peace and enhancement of the democratic process are well known. Especially in Geneva, the city of peace, I felt it all the more appropriate to recall the basic relationships of science and politics that constitute the theme of my assignment. Science knows no national boundaries. In a troubled world, communications between scientists have often supplemented and aided international understanding when political solutions seemed remote.

In the United States, we have a long tradi-tion of recognizing that politics and science mix. Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson actively sought advancement and applications of science to serve public purposesthen to help a newly developing nation.

Science and the democratic process were found to blend easily. They still do today. Both reflect a common striving for progress; both test emerging truths through the process of critical inquiry; both are subject to constant revision and to revitalization-not by edicts of a few but by contributions of

We recognize more today than ever before, however, that science is itself passive. Even technology is amoral, for the deliberate use of science for practical purposes may produce adverse as well as beneficial effects. What results depends much more on decisions of the politician and parliamentarians than on decisions of scientists or engineers. This, in fact, is science policy.

We are then faced with the question of what information is required for policy deci-

sions.

If all history were recorded, we would probably find that emperors and empires failed for want of some specific piece of information. In our own technological era, satirists picture governments going down to defeat, or at least paralyzed not by too little information but by too much.

The scientific world also views with alarm

problems arising from an exponential growth in literature that seems to propagate faster than a colony of rabbits. This topic of "Information Required by Parliaments in a World Increasingly Dependent Upon Science" thus invites opportunities to view the double calamity when two information-rich universes meet.

Rather than deal with the obvious, I should like to pose the thesis that additional burdens imposed on representative government by questions of public policy involving science can be met by the improved quality and structuring of information for deliberation and decisionmaking. And although this notion is discussed with principal reference to the U.S. Government, we may find a note of optimism: that all parliaments may find science a source of remedies as well as of problems-a means for fulfilling their modern basic functions in a democracy.

SCIENCE CONFOUNDS POLICYMAKING

Every parliament has a fundamental need for information to aid in the making of intelligent choices. The growing agenda about science and technology has sharply intensified that need. The pace of scientific discovery and engineering application has accelerated. Subject matter has become more complex. Relationships among Government, universities, and private enterprise have become more intertwined. Budgets have grown sharply, and policy decisions affect more people, more quickly and more continually than ever before.

To make these decisions, we have a critical need for information that is authentic, complete, and timely. And it must be available in a form suitable for comprehension and

employment by a policymaker.

Delegates to this symposium of the Interparliamentary Union do not need to be reminded that the primary involvement of parliaments with science arises not from science for its own sake, but from the potential contribution of science to serve society. We know from recent experience that technology and science may strengthen national security, stimulate economic growth, provide food and fiber, counter disability and disease, and alter the qualities of natural environ-

This last concern refers not only to chemical pollution of air and water, but also to esthetic pollution of our cities from urban crowding amidst tasteless architecture, and acoustical pollution from noise. learned from the energetic application of science to military affairs that the consequences of science are critically influenced by policy decisions in the public domain. Thus, to maintain an environment salubrious to both body and spirit, the policymaker must seek a continuous partnership with science.

FIVE CLASSES OF ISSUES

Science-related decisions by the policy-maker involve five classes of issues: (a) Identifying goals; (b) assigning priorities between competing goals (usually through appropriations); (c) determining the scope and direction of Federal involvement, in relation to State and private initiatives; (d) matching manpower, facilities, and information transfer facilities to goals, and (e) designating responsibility and authority to Federal agencies. All of these steps may be influenced by opportunities afforded by science.

INFORMATION ILLUMINATES ALTERNATIVES

Information about progress through science is then needed for three functions: to illuminate alternatives; to provide criteria for choice; and to facilitate political strategy.

The first role of information is to illuminate choices—not scientific choices, but political choices. Here, considerations of science must be integrated with economics, political processes, domestic and social policies, and institutional relationships.

Because resources are inevitably limited, choices must be made between alternative goals—as between funds for manned exploration of Mars or an accelerated search for cancer cure. Choices must be made between alternative means to reach the same goal—such as between manned bombers or submarine-based missiles.

INFORMATION PROVIDES CRITERIA FOR CHOICE

Information also forms the basis of rational criteria for choice. Cost-effectiveness indexes comprise one set of yardsticks for which data are required to assess both the costs and the benefits. As methodology for long-range planning improves, criteria will take into account total as well as initial costs, and also manpower requirements. Effects on society will also become a factor in choice, more and more amenable to rational actions as we conduct research in behavioral sciences as intently as we do in the natural sciences.

What is an acceptable level for sonic boom? Someday, we may adopt quantified criteria for such political questions in a democracy, based on the proposition that actions in the long run must increase options for the greatest number of individuals.

INFORMATION FACILITATES STRATEGIES

Every policymaker knows that correct decisions depend as much on timing and on effective implementation as on the original choice. Such a decision thus depends on balance between short-range and long-range factors, between investment and opportunistic exploitation. Because of the high costs and high risks that attend development of say a new supersonic transport or nuclear powered ships, there is clearly a need to avoid premature decisions. To defer commitment, to maximize options, to make the U-turn when at a deadend street, are well-known strategies for the effective exercise of political power and responsibility. All of these qualities of flexibility become more viable in the presence of scientific facts.

TYPICAL SCIENCE POLICY ISSUES

This informational framework for policy-making assumes real dimensions when considering science policy issues concerning both "ends" and "means." The first session of the 89th Congress was confronted with such questions as: authorizing of \$5.4 billion for space exploration; long-range planning for space activities following the 1970 manned lunar landing; establishing goals for marine exploration and resources development, and improving coordination of 20

agencies engaged in oceanography; abating air pollution; expanding fresh water resources; conducting research on and developing a supersonic transport and highspeed rail transportation between Boston and Washington; establishing a new Environmental Science Services Administration; specifying requirements for academically related basis research, and for support of graduate students; defining needs to increase the number and geographical distribution of centers of research and educational excellence; facilitating the transfer of science to civilian-based technology; defining criteria for site selection for a new 200 Bev accelerator; studying economic implications of U.S. conversion to the metric system; appropriating over \$16 billion for federally sponsored research and development, nearly half related to military security, but an even larger amount devoted to such technology-based activities as public works.

The list only suggests the diversity and complexity of questions involving science and technology—the relevance to a vast number of public purposes that become reflected, incidentally, in the jurisdiction of a large number of different congressional committees.

CONGRESSIONAL CONCERN FOR ADEQUATE SCIENCE ADVICE

In the United States, the White House moved late in 1957 to meet the unprecedented challenge of science-based issues. The President has now available a four-component advisory apparatus of experts: the office of Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology and the President's Science Advisory Committee; in 1959, the Federal Council for Science and Technology; and in 1962, the statutory Office of Science and Technology.

These initiatives found our Congress, already "outmanned and outgunned," at an even further disadvantage in maintaining some degree of parity in technical competence for policymaking. The Congress is continually the target of much unsolicited information. Some information originates from parties at interest, some from the executive branch. Frequently, the information is flavored by advocacy. While such contributions are essential to democratic political process for the Congress to be a mirror of consensus, the purification of information by impartial analysis, "to separate the signal from the noise," vastly increases value of information to the policymaker.

In 1963, Senators Monroney, Anderson, and Bartlett, and Congressmen Miller, Daddario, and Sibal, proposed a variety of steps that ranged from strengthening existing staff elements to creating entirely new legislative agencies patterned after the Office of Science and Technology.

All of these proposals reflect the desire for better rather than more science-related information. Even more significantly, these proposals implied informational resources made more useful through analysis. Decisionmakers always want access to raw data—but they now demanded access to powerful staff resources where the only loyalty is to objective interpretation. By this means, the Congress, like the President, may ask the right questions.

STRENGTHENED SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Many new sources have been developed. The Congress now looks to the President's Office of Science and Technology for governmentwide information on such interagency programs as weather services, oceanography, and science information. Otherwise, in crossing agency lines and committee jurisdiction, these programs tend to be fragmented so as to go beyond rational assessment.

The Congress also looks to the National Science Foundation as a source of statistics

and analysis concerning funds for research and development, scientific and technical manpower and facilities. Such data are categorized so as to show the distribution by field, by agency, by performer, and even by geographical distribution.

The Congress has also recognized the function of the National Academy of Sciences to advise the Congress as well as the executive branch on special topics, but especially on the needs and opportunities of science itself. A new Academy of Engineering may soon be an additional source of counsel.

Congress has long sought the advice of competent outsiders. Greater use is being made of expert witnesses whose testimony is solicited singly or in concert to explain implications of scientific developments, rather than to invite a position on an issue.

These sources are increasingly effective as the Members inform themselves in order to break through the monolithic views of administration witnesses, and to identify alternatives from which the final decision was made—a decision often propounded with such energy as to make it appear that only one choice was available. Ultimately, however, the Congress has had to reinforce its own committee organization, its committee staff, and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress as primary resources for gathering facts, for helping to identify issues, for obtaining testimony at hearings, and for identifying pros and cons of alternative actions.

NEW CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

When congressional apprehension rose in 1963 over the lack of control over growing research budgets, the House established a new Select Committee on Government Research. In its 1 year of operation, it developed a broad base of statistics and findings primarily on administrative elements of Federal research and development. Interestingly enough, its major recommendation for action applied to the Congress rather than to the Executive—to establish a new Joint Congressional Committee on Research Policy.

And also established in 1963 was a new Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, chaired by Congressman Emilio Q. Daddero, one of the U.S. delegates to this symposium. His subcommittee opened with a series of "posture" hearings, and has continued even more intensified activity since. During this last session, the subcommittee held hearings on the present and future role of the National Science Foundation to assure the quantity and quality of the Nation's science resources to meet foreseeable national needs. Amendments to the Organic Act are being prepared.

In the 89th Congress, a new Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs was established in the House Government Operations Committee under Congressman Henry Reuss that has focused on conflicts between Federal research and education. A Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower under Senator Gaylord Nelson held extensive hearings on the implications of undue localization of Federal research funds, while a new Subcommittee on Government Research has been established under Senator FRED HARRIS with a yet undisclosed agenda.

As suggested by the sample of actions of the 89th Congress mentioned earlier, many substantive and appropriation committees have been looking at how science serves explicit public purposes.

SCIENCE POLICY RESEARCH DIVISION

The major new step to expand the base of information and advice needed by the entire Congress to deal with science-related issues was establishment of the Science Policy Research Division (SPRD) in the fall of 1964. Following patterns enunciated through the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act of 1946 in such fields as international affairs, conservation, and social welfare, this new unit

was established in the Legislative Reference Service by appointment of a number of technical specialists to serve all Members of both parties and all committees. The division deals with two sets of issues: concerning deliberate exploitation of scientific discovery to serve public purposes, and concerning the allocation or development of funds and manpower required to fuel the Nation's scientific

Emphasis in the new unit was placed more on policy-type research than on referencetype inquiries and 1 year of operating experience strongly confirms congressional interest in utilizing this new capability at its highest intellectual potential. In operating terms, it functions much like the President's Office of Science and Technology. Issues are virtually the same. The main difference lies in SPRD having to avoid partisan advocacy and in having no responsibility to operate as does OST in carrying out coordination of interagency programs for the President.

During its first year, the division received more than 600 legislative-related inquiriesfrom 48 different Senators and 105 Congressmen, and from some 16 standing subcommittees in the 2 Houses. Assistance was furnished for 8 different committee hear-Assistance was ings; 60 analytical studies were prepared, 10 of which were of 75 or more pages. Two major studies have been released with acknowledgment of SPRD authorship: "Government Weather Programs," a report of 203 pages for the House Committee on Government Operations, and "The National Science Foundation—a General Review of Its First 15 Years," a report of 286 pages prepared for the House Science and Astronautics Committee. The division also filled 30 requests for major addresses or statements; 175 for personal consultation; 118 for factual materials. It monitored over 450 requests for scientific information unrelated to policy.

NEW TECHNIQUES

One of the most important functions of the new division in dealing with science policy is the structuring of information to reveal relationships that often escape notice but that become increasingly significant because of implicit if not explicit impact of a decision on elements not conspicuously related to the issue. Arrays of facts make visible the inconsistencies between policies and programs of different agencies; time series show trends of budgetary commitments where past decisions may preempt future options.

This approach has been extended to become a systems analysis mode of problem solving. And here, it becomes possible to treat in a policy sense all elements related to one objective, for example, such as low-cost transportation. Otherwise, treatment as single elements of rail, ship, and/or truck could result in contradictory and self-defeating policies. A similar treatment proves necessary when dealing with management of human ecology where goals of high agricultural productivity enhanced by use of pesticides collide with other goals of protecting human health.

These steps-from fact, to one dimensional interpretation of fact, to a multidimensional analysis—are essential if information for science-based questions is to receive maximum utility.

NEW TOOLS

A collateral step yet to come is to employ modern automatic data processing equipment to store and retrieve selectively such facts as may be desired and, through experimental permutations, to search for subtle relationships not otherwise readily disclosed. Such equipment has been proposed to facilitate housekeeping chores of legislatures-to permit rapid readout of budget data or to determine status of pending legislation; to record votes, or to locate documents as their numbers increase. But such equipment also makes it possible to keep track of contract awards, the status of the Nation's manpower-and to test on paper through technoeconomic models the quantitative merits of alternatives, say between two techniques for flood control. Such tools will be no panacea for dealing with science-related issues, but they will help meet problems of complexity and change, especially to permit a legisla-ture to meet the expertise of the executive branch with some informed but independent judgments of their own.

Such tools must be servants, not masters. They should not be permitted to hasten the political process beyond the speed of human deliberation, or beyond the rate of reciprocal communication between parliaments and the grassroots of consensus.

Staff of a very special kind are required for legislative research and for effective employment of new informational tools dealing with science. Expertise in scientific disciplines is necessary, but not sufficient. Other background is necessary in legislative process, public law, economics, foreign affairs. Personal qualities are required of objectivity and ability to sense and solve problems, think logically and structure ideas. Staff are needed who combine muscular skepticism with a humanistic approach to science and technology-who, like the language translator, must speak two languages-that of science or engineering, and that of politics.

Blending science with public policy is so new that no readymade academic training ground exists for recruitment. Also, most candidates in this area began their pro-fessional development "at the bench" and usually view policy research as a diversion from their career. It has thus been necessary in the Science Policy Research Division to develop new policy staff at the same time that the analytical needs of the Congress were being satisfied.

NEW CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVES

The 89th Congress has developed a new confidence in dealing with these issues in science and technology. There has been selective, critical probing; review of arguments of the Executive; action to end fence straddling, for example in a move toward more institutional grants for research as compared with project grants.

In the case of oceanography, the Congress has taken initiative over a wide front of ac-tion ranging from improved coordination to establishment of marine exploration as a new public purpose.

But involvement of the U.S. Congress in science policy affairs is intensifying, because the issues themselves are changing: after a vigorous growth of Federal science mainly to serve military security needs, more stabilized international relations and the growing concern about economic and social problems are accelerating a transition to a new mode of Federal technology. The present plateau in U.S. spending for research and development provides an opportunity to build a far more durable base for the present science-technology enterprise. A major problem, therefore, arises on how to employ and dispose the capabilities developed for security objectives for the continued benefit of man, how to integrate this composite of ideas and talent with the other significant elements in a free enterprise, pluralistic society of capital and preneurship which have been the key to vigorous extension of our democratic ideals.

We thus pose a new set of science policy issues that pivot on the old questions of "Whether?" and "How?" Such questions were historically raised in relation to the scientific projects of military significance. But these past decisions did not have the economic, legal, and geopolitical implications of those being raised today.

Because the new issues cannot be handled on faith, protected by necessary considerations of military security, the funding and the legislative actions on science-related issues in the future must be far more carefully tuned to public support than may have been possible in the past. The Congress may extend its activities to new areas as they have previously in agricultural and health research. Recent action in the water resources, transportation, and pollution fields may well signal this trend.

To accomplish this transition, however, the U.S. Congress, as a mirror of consensus, is expecting to play an even stronger role in linking science to public policy, in blending engineering, economics, law and politics, funds and organization—the essential ingredients of technology. Federal structure for science and technology, at all levels, is being evaluated to update missions and roles, and legislation is being considered to meet the rapid obsolescence of science-based Federal agencies. But special interests and the general public must become better informed and more energetic participants in the democratic system, by conducting science policy research of their own.

SUMMARY

If parliaments are to maintain their basic functions in a democracy, they must provide for science to serve society. Better informa-tion is needed in dealing with science-related issues in order that they fulfill their coordinate role in policymaking-to identify public purposes; assign priorities; determine scope of Federal involvement; match sources to goals; and assure prudent Federal management. Such information must reveal alternatives of action as well as the criteria for choice and appropriate political strategies.

What we need is better information-not necessarily more. We must draw on the entire base of scientific discovery and on technology. We must also draw on the body of literature dealing with economics, law, public administration, and foreign affairs. Numerous devices to elicit information are available. But for information to be of maximum value for use by policymakers, it must be structured, analyzed, and arrayed to reveal complex, subtle, yet vital, relationships.

While these analyses for parliaments draw primarily on contributions of authorities in many fields, they may require a new family of staff resources. In the United States, a Science Policy Research Division has been established to serve the U.S. Congress. Its functions are similar to those of the President's Office of Science and Technology. But here, a policy research staff has been insulated from political involvement so that as advisers, their only loyalty is to professional objectivity. Their main role is thus to help the Congress ask the right questions.

Modern automatic data processing equipment and new information handling techniques will be increasingly utilized to meet the complexity and pace of modern decisionmaking. But these tools must never be viewed as substitutes for shrewd, informed

political judgment.

Finally, in a representative government, it is increasingly apparent that parliaments must be not only recipients of science-based information. Parliaments must also be the source of information and interpretationto illuminate the issues and alternatives before the Nation. Only by this step can we assure adequate exchange of views with the constituency, for parliamentary action to indeed be "the people's choice."

GOODNESS IS AS GOODNESS DOES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Dr. James A. McCain, president of Kansas State University, delivered the commencement address at Marymount College on May 30, 1965.

This address displayed a remarkable insight and understanding concerning America's image abroad. This evaluation entitled "Goodness Is as Goodness Does" is built upon the central theme of our personal and national preoccupation with our image both at home and abroad.

Describing this as disturbing, Dr. Mc-Cain states:

It reflects far more anxiety over how we appear than how we are, over form rather than substance, over avoiding the appearance of evil rather than evil itself.

His suggestions in contrasting American with European education are most helpful and because this address forms such a steady guide in these days, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOODNESS IS AS GOODNESS DOES

Americans, like Narcissus of the Greek legend, have suddenly discovered their image. But unlike Narcissus, they are distressed by what they see. National associations of doctors, lawyers, and teachers, for example, are employing public information programs to change bad public images of their respective professions. Chambers of commerce have turned to Madison Avenue advertising experts to alter negative aspects of their images that hinder economic growth of their respective communities.

In fact, America's image abroad was a major issue in the last two national elections. All of this is disturbing. It reflects far more anxiety over how we appear than how we are, over form rather than substance, over avoiding the appearance of evil rather than evil itself.

You college graduates of 1965, departing the groves of academe to enter an imageridden society, would do well to apply the superior sense of values and intellectual insights provided by your education to the task of redressing the balance. More specifically, we should be more energetic in removing shortcomings than making it appear we don't have any.

Take the problem of America's image abroad as a case in point. We have been shocked by mob assaults on U.S. embassies throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America in protest against our military actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. However, I can assure you from personal experience that overt hostility toward the United States is by no means a recent development but has flourished for many years in these same nations.

Much of this attitude is a compound of Communist propaganda and an altogether too human disposition to be resentful of a rich uncle who lives on the other side of the tracks. However, from visits I made during the past 7 years to some 50 universities in Europe, Asia, and the Near East and conferences with scores of Latin American students and professors, I assess this image as basically intellectual and social, rather than political, in character.

Outside the United States, universities are more influential in molding public opinion and reflecting the attitudes they mold than is the case here. The United States, according to the majority opinion I encountered, is equated with materialism, anti-intellectualism, and racial intolerance.

Our image abroad has been done grievous damage by race relations and civil rights crises in Arkansas, and more recently in Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. In Europe, in the spring of 1957, I found communism universally stigmatized by the brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolt by Russian

tanks and troops. Just a few months later our Little Rock crisis more than offset whatever propaganda advantage we derived from

On the same trip I was shocked to learn that Scandinavian mothers dreaded the possible Americanizing of their children much as we abhor juvenile delinquency. Comic books, bubble gum, and rock and roll music were the hallmarks of the American influence.

European professors and students who had visited American campuses acknowledged the excellence of American scholarship in the major disciplines and the first-rate quality of our university Ph. D. programs. However, they were stunned by hyperthyroid student activity programs which undeniably depress undergraduate academic achievement with a resulting quality of education considerably below minimum European standards.

Unfortunate as this image is, I find even more distressing the proposals for correcting it. One extensive public opinion probe indicated that twenty percent of our people had no remedy to offer and the remainder favored more foreign aid, less foreign aid, or firing the Secretary of State. Apparently no one thought of remedying the conditions responsible for the image.

Now, how Americans are regarded by other people is a matter of vital concern to all of us. In "This Little Village We Call the World", to borrow a happy phrase from Adlai Stevenson, our economic welfare is conditioned by the rapport we can maintain with the common market or our capacity to persuade Nigerians to add wheat to their diet.

suade Nigerians to add wheat to their diet.

More important, victory in the cold war
may well be decided by whether we or the
Communists win the loyalties of some one
and a third billion uncommitted peoples.

Obviously our self-interest requires that we zealously cultivate a favorable public image abroad. To do so successfully we must deal first with whatever shortcomings earn us a bad reputation, not the reputation itself.

Are we, as charged, a materialistic people more concerned with creature comforts than creative arts? By way of denial, we can cite our hundreds of symphony orchestras and art museums, unprecedented sales of paperback books and classical phonograph records. Unfortunately, however, the "Beverly Hillbillies" are a regrettably accurate measure of public taste in television, Mr. Minow's intelectual wasteland, and studies reveal that only 17 percent of Americans can be found reading a book at any given time in contrast with 40 percent of the people of many European nations. The Hollywood films which attract the largest audiences at home and give us such a lurid reputation abroad are usually sensational and utterly tasteless.

In contrast with the high humanitarian principles we profess, we must admit to a distressing degree of racial prejudice and discrimination. True enough, recent civil rights legislation by our Federal Government and the imminent prospect of legislation to remove racial barriers to voter registration are major steps toward solving these problems. Nevertheless, intolerance still poisons the hearts and minds of many of our people and still finds overt expression not only in the South but in other parts of the Nation as well.

I know that many of you in this graduating class have prepared for the teaching profession. If education is to contribute more effectively to cultural and intellectual enrichment, as teachers you must accept for yourselves and exact from your students unprecedented standards of excellence.

We have witnessed a gradual erosion of the image of the teacher as a person of profound knowledge. Chaucer's clerk of Oxford 600 years ago had "At his beddes heed twenty bokes, clad in blak and reed of Aristotle and his philosophye of a pedagogue in the eight-

eeneth century, Goldsmith rhapsodized and still the wonder grew that one small head could carry all he knew."

Too often today, by contrast, public opinion accords the teacher a weak third place, after the doctor and lawyer, on the totem pole of erudition.

I know from personal experience that a distinguished college such as Marymount requires of those preparing to teach a broad liberal education including exposure to one or more of the fine arts. A principal measure of the success of these studies will be the extent to which you continue to cultivate them now that the compulsions of class attendance and grades are removed.

I think it both timely and fitting to recommend to the teachers a vigorous pursuit of new knowledge through avid reading of firstrate books and magazines, and no less so that they become patrons and supporters of the arts.

With the teacher thus fortified, the student's sights should be raised to a comparable degree. Four suggestions occur to me as I contrast American with European education.

First, high scholastic achievement should be enthroned as the distinction most to be cherished. In Sweden at the close of each high school academic year those students scoring highest on examinations are paraded through town on the shoulders of their fellows and earn the right to wear a distinctive cap to herald their achievement. In America such accolades are too often confined to beauty queens or, in schools such as mine, to quarterbacks or 6-foot-9 pivot men.

Secondly, a minimum requirement for high school graduation should be competence in the use of oral and written English. Ours are the world's only universities which admit students still in need of basic instruction in their mother tongue.

Third, I would revive the old-fashioned notion that a sound education is literary in character. Former Chancellor Hutchins of the University of Chicago deplored the fact that one can attend many American colleges for 4 years and earn a degree without having been required to read one good book in its entirety. This criticism is applicable with even more validity to many of our secondary schools. To cultivate enthusiasm for good reading should be a central aim of instruction.

Finally, compositions by the masters should have a major place on the programs of musicians and musical groups. Certainly no reasonable person would ban popular music or the stirring marches of the band from the high school scene. But to emphasize these at the expense of Beethoven, Brahms and Mozart is to distort the ends of education.

Of course, college graduates generally, whether teachers or members of other learned professions, must accept major responsibilities for sharpening America for her growing role of world leadership.

The task of stamping out intolerance will require the combined efforts of home, school, church, and the law, with the leadership and example supplied by college-educated men and women. False racist doctrines must be exposed to the light of scientific fact at every opportunity.

Persons of influence must help persuade the general public that not only our self-respect but our security demands a solution of this problem. The nonwhite nations of Asia, Africa, and South America will inevitably be more impressed by the treatment of our nonwhite minority at home than the idealism we profess abroad, and to win the loyalty of these nations is a major aim of the U.S. foreign policy.

Similarly, I would enlist your support for these various international programs through which America is so magnificently redeeming a responsibility for world leader-

After a shaky start, the Peace Corps has discovered and put to excellent use an unsuspected reservoir of idealism among American youth, so long regarded as frivolous and self-seeking.

Through people to people, educational exchange, and foreign aid programs, we have extended the hand of friendship and shared our plenty with less privileged people all over

the globe.

Thus the typical American of the 1960's is no longer the smug isolationist lampooned in the foreign press prior to World War II, and you can be certain that our image abroad

has improved accordingly.

What Americans are, then, is the essence; the image we convey is only incidental. Our greatness as a nation is exceeded only by our aspirations. College graduates have an obligation stronger than most to seek the realization of those aspirations. The image will follow the achievement as the night follows the day.

ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today marks the 48th year since the Estonian—Diet—declared Estonia an independent state. I wish to take this opportunity to offer warm congratulations to the Estonian people and their thousands of friends in America upon

commemorating that event.

But Estonia today is no longer independent-it saddens us to reflect that this proud nation has fallen under the voke of the Soviet Union. In fact, it has been incorporated into the Soviet Union as one of the constituent republics. This was accomplished contrary to the will of the Estonian people during World War II. Although the Estonians do not relish their present imprisonment by Russia, they view occupation somewhat as an old phenomenon. Czarist Russia once occupied the country for almost 200 years, from 1721 to 1918. Yet even as Russian domination existed and as Russia attempted to replace Estonian culture with that of the Russians, Estonian nationalist fervor flourished and ultimately led to independence. That nationalistic spirit remains strong today.

World War I provided Estonia with the first genuine opportunity at self-determination. She took advantage of it and proclaimed her independence. After fending off numerous attacks by the Communists, she was able to enjoy approximately 22 years of relative independence. Her domestic program of increasing educational opportunities and agricultural and industrial output were summarily halted when Russia reoccupied her in June 1940. By July 1940 at Russian-sponsored Estonian Government had declared Estonia a member of the Soviet Union—an example of peaceful

coexistence in action.

Born largely as a result of one war and imprisoned 22 years later after the outbreak of another war, Estonia's people have proved their hardiness through enduring so many years of turmoil and pain. But even these tragic circumstances have not compromised Estonia's desire for freedom and self-determination. This is truly a tribute to a brave and selfless people.

As we offer congratulations and cite Estonia's past achievements, let us also consider her future. Let us pledge anew our promise to aid her in her quest for freedom and independence. Estonia's plight must become the concern of all freemen.

FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, ever since 1961 I have sponsored legislation to establish a Federal Department of Transportation.

I am deeply concerned that a nation so heavily dependent on transportation continues to rely upon a transportation system that is in a state of chaos.

According to the President, our national transportation policies and programs are spread across 35 agencies and cost about \$5 billion a year. Yet, there is now no central responsibility in the executive branch for developing unified transportation policy and little, if any, coordination among the hodge-podge of programs which subsidize or promote the various modes.

There is a pressing need, in the interests of a balanced, effective transportation system, to bring order out of this situation. A transportation department could help fulfill this need and, undoubtedly, save the taxpayers a lot of money.

I was glad, therefore, that the President has come to share my view about this matter. In his state of the Union message he proposed creation of a separate cabinet department on transportation.

In an article in the February 18 issue of Commonweal, the perceptive and able writer, Mr. William V. Shannon, succinctly spells out the dimensions of the transportation problem confronting our country. He points out the creation of a Federal Transportation Department is "only a modest, first step" toward the rationalization of transportation policies and programs that is so urgently needed.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by William V. Shannon be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRANSPORTATION TANGLE

One of the surprises in President Johnson's state of the Union message last month was his request for a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation. This has been a favorite idea of reformers interested in transportation problems; Senator CLIFFORD CASE, New Jersey Republican, and other Members of Congress have from time to time introduced bills to create such a department, but no one expected President Johnson to espouse the change this year.

A British friend of mine who works at the World Bank expressed mystification that such a department had not been set up long ago or that its proposal now should be expected to stir any controversy. "Whenever the Bank sends a mission to even the most underdeveloped country, we assume as a matter of course that it will have a ministry of transport. Why doesn't the United States as the most developed country in the world have one?"

The principal answer is that ours is the only country in the world in which all the major forms of transportation—railroads, air-

lines, trucking, buses, barge lines, and merchant marine—are in private ownership. Each of them has at various times received enormous subsidies: land grants for the railroads, mail subsidies and the construction of airports for the airlines. Government-built superhighways for the trucks and buses, canals for the barges, and construction subsidies for the merchant marine. But when planning and regulation are under consideration, this public largess is forgotten. It is not in the interest of the various private operators to call it to anyone's attention, and the public tends to accept the myth that a railroad or an airline is a private enterprise quite like any other.

If most or all of these transportation elements were Government-owned, it would clarify the nature of the Nation's transportation problems. It would then be apparent that the genuine competition is not between rival airlines (such as United v. TWA) or between rival railroads (the Pennsylvania v. the New York Central) but between the different types of transport. The railroads compete with the airlines and buses for passenger traffic; they compete with the barge lines for certain freight business and with the trucks for other kinds. The wave of railroad mergers which started more than a decade ago and which is still underway makes this clear; only merged railroads are financially strong enough to withstand the competition of the truckers and other rivals. The discontinuance of passenger service also points to the same direction. The retreat from the passenger business represents a confession that the railroads cannot effectively compete for passengers under circumstances as they now exist. But both the mergers and the reductions in service are erratic moves decided upon solely on the basis of the financial circumstances of particular railroad companies. The interests of bondholders and stockholders get more attention than the public interest. Although the Interstate Commerce Commission has to approve specific mergers and cutbacks in service, there is at present no way for the Government to relate these moves to the rest of the transportation industry or to any coherent plan.

At the State level, Government has been edging toward public ownership. Thus, the State of New York controls the Long Island Railroad and is now negotiating an agreement with Connecticut for joint ownership of the passenger service of the New Haven Railroad in the bistate metropolitan area. Somewhat similar quasi-public arrange-ments for commuter railroad service exist in Boston and Philadelphia. At the Federal level, however, there is reluctance to develop concerted transportation policies, much less adopt any course of action that smacks of socialism. The result is that odd gaps and anomalies have begun to develop in the Nation's transportation network. It is impossible, for example, to travel by train between two such sizable cities as Boston, Mass., and Portland, Maine; indeed, there is no passenger railroad service at all in the State of Maine. There are already a half-dozen State capitals in this country which cannot be reached by train. Northeast, the airline that serves New England, is not profitable; the effort to make it so by cutting it in on the New York-to-Miami run already shared by two other airlines failed to generate enough additional revenues. Other airlines serving regional markets are healthier than Northeast but some are still economically marginal.

What would a "systems analysis" recommend in place of this jerry-built corporate structure in transportation? The densely populated corridor from Boston to Washington, D.C., provides an example. The hourly shuttle service by jet makes no sense for safety reasons; the airspace has become so crowded in this corridor that pilots have

to take evasive action on almost every trip to avoid midair collisions. Travel by bus and private automobile does not make sense either for reasons of time and efficiency. Buses, even though breaking speed limits, still take more than 3 hours to drive from New York to Washington; private automobiles take about an hour longer. The logical way—safe, fast, and efficient—would be to travel from Boston to New York or New York to Washington by train.

It is now technologically possible to make either of these trips by train in less than 2 hours. Jet service should be reserved for long trips of 500 miles or more where the greater distance makes the use of jets reasonable and economic. Automobiles should be reserved for pleasure trips to the mountains and other relatively inaccessible places and for travel in and around towns and metropolitan suburbs where space on roads and in parking lots is still available; they ought not to be used for travel between major cities or into the congested centers those cities. A rational allocation of patronage along these lines would eliminate any need for the fourth airport now being urged for Metropolitan New York (in addition to Kennedy, La Guardia, and Newark), or for the four extra lanes now being planned for the New Jersey Turnpike, or for the mon-10-mile bridge across Long Island Sound from Long Island to Connecticut being urged by superbuilder Robert Moses. It would also sharply reduce the fatalities from automobile accidents (nearly 50,000 persons were killed last year) and would make air travel safer by thinning out the traffic in the airlanes.

Similar reallocations would have bene-cial effects if applied to freight. effects if applied Trucks are ideal for lightweight cargo such as transistors and electronic parts and for transport between local points, but the trucking of heavy freight and over long distances is socially wasteful; such freight belongs on the railroads. Few motorists or taxpayers realize that highways would be considerably cheaper to build and would last much longer without major repairs if they were only used by automobiles; it is the heavy trucks pounding them day and night with the burden of tons of freight that wear out the Nation's highways.

The need also exists for many more mergers in both the railroad and airline industries with the stronger, moneymaking carriers eliminating wasteful competition with one another on profitable routes and absorbing the weaker, money-losing carriers. Transportation is a public utility just as are water, electricity, and telephone service; fast, efficient, safe, and dependable transportation for passengers and for freight ought to be available in all sections of the country whether they are rich or poor, densely populated or thinly populated, profitable or unprofitable.

Any effort to rationalize the Nation's transportation network will jeopardize the existing congeries of private interests. President Johnson's proposal for a Cabinet Department of Transportation is only a modest, first step toward rationalization, but it is sure to be resisted for that very reason.

COMMEMORATIVE POLISH MILLEN-NIUM U.S. POSTAGE STAMP

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have just received word from the Postmaster General that a special postage stamp will be issued this year to commemorate the Polish millennium, as I requested in a letter to him on February 18. I am very pleased by this news and I ask unanimous consent that my letter and Postmaster General O'Brien's affirmative response be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the REC-ORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1966.

Hon. LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR LARRY: I appreciate your assurance that the suggested Polish millennium stamp is under consideration as the last commemoratives for 1966 are being selected.

In writing now, I want to reaffirm my interest in this stamp and suggest how very meaningful it would be to the American people.

Poland has long been a beleaguered land. But her creative, strong-willed people have endured partition, tyranny, war, and now the oppression of communism, maintaining their love of beauty, their spiritual strength, and intense pride in their Polish heritage.

Our society has been nourished by the Polish people who have come to the United States and taught us to appreciate more than we might otherwise have learned of the remarkable culture now trapped behind the Iron Curtain. A stamp to commemorate the Polish millennium will awaken even more interest in the glory of Poland's ancient heritage. I very much hope that it will be approved.

With thanks for your consideration, and best wishes

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL. Washington, D.C., February 23, 1966.

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, U.S. Senate.

Washington, D.C.
DEAR SENATOR: It gives me great pleasure

to advise you that I have approved a com-memorative stamp to mark 1,000 years of Polish culture.

Because of your personal interest in this subject, I thought you would like to know about the stamp in advance of the public announcement. The date and place of firstday sale have not been determined at this

Your endorsement contributed signifi-cantly to my decision to issue a stamp for this important anniversary.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN.

THE EDUCATION SECTIONS OF THE BUDGET

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, among the most important proposals the Congress shall act upon this year are those affecting our commitments to a myriad of education programs.

In just a few years we have made great strides toward insuring the best possible education for all Americans The landmark legislation passed in the most recent sessions earned Congress the title,

"The Education Congress."

Just last month, I was extremely pleased to hear the elected leader of a great people tell us of his unlimited confidence in this Nation. He told us that we were strong and wealthy enough so that our commitments abroad need not curtail our progress at home He said specifically he would ask this Congress to "provide the resources to carry for-ward, with full vigor, the great health and education programs enacted last year." I associated myself fully with those remarks then, and I believe in them

But I am disheartened by a discrepancy between our vital education goals and certain proposals which are contained in the education sections of the new budget

The budget, indeed, calls for the resources to carry forward the education programs we enacted last year; but it also calls for a radical retrenchment in the federally impacted areas programs and a severe slash in funds for our land grant colleges. Several other longstanding education programs also are earmarked for substantial reductions.

Although I wish to address myself today to the proposed cutback in the impacted areas programs, I want to make it clear that the severe reductions in education programs which have demonstrated their effectiveness and value, if carried out, would result in a great setback for education in the United States.

There is no justification for reducing our commitments to progress in educa-To reduce education programs solely because it was decided that money must be saved somewhere would be the worst form of false economy and could seriously affect the plans and budgets of thousands of school districts throughout the country.

The impacted areas program, President, since its inception in 1950, has been a model of efficient Federal cooperation in our country's educational endeavors

For fiscal year 1966, the budget called for an appropriation of \$347 million to support the program of payments to federally impacted school districts under Public Law 874, and of \$50 million for assistance to school districts under Public Law 815. The new budget requests \$183.4 million and \$22.9 million. respectively, for these programs. Thus, the two programs have been hit upon as a likely area for an economy drive, which, if successful, would result in a savings of \$190.7 million. It is my conviction, however, that savings of this scope would be neither justifiable nor advisable.

The budget states that the proposed cutbacks are justified in light of the impact of the large new Federal assistance programs on the schools. The document goes on to say that 874-815 assistance should be adjusted periodically to reflect the growth of assistance under Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I am not at all convinced of the soundness of the reasoning in those two statements.

It must not be forgotten that Public Law 815-874 are special programs of education assistance with very special reasons behind them. They may be said to have a dual purpose: to compensate for the weakened tax base which results when a good portion of the real property in a school district is federally owned, and thus not subject to local property taxes; and to help local districts to manage the increased outlay necessary for making good schools available to the children of Federal employees. With respect to the former, it should be noted that about 87 percent of the land in Nevada is federally owned.

On the other hand, the programs of aid under the 1965 elementary and secondary act have nothing to do with federally affected areas. They are intended to raise the quality of educational

opportunity in general, and especially in economically deficient areas.

The key to the 815-874 programs is Federal burden. The key to the other program is a more complex concept involving overall educational standards and poverty.

Since the purpose of the programs are manifestly not the same, I see no reason why increase in assistance under Public Law 89-10 should be taken as justification for decreases under Public Law

815-874.

The effect of the proposed impacted area program reduction on the State of Nevada, Mr. President, illustrates the lack of wisdom of the cutbacks. Nevada would lose about \$2 million a year in impacted area assistance—about the same amount it receives under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The result of the reduction, then, would be that little or no more Federal assistance for Nevada education would be avaliable than there was before the great educational programs enacted in the last few years. Funds under Public Law 89–10 will not by any means compensate for the loss of impacted area funds.

This would clearly mean a step backward for education in Nevada and some other States which would not be sharing in the education funds they expect and vitally need to finance a number of worthwhile programs to improve the caliber of American education.

Thirteen of Nevada's seventeen counties rely on impacted area assistance for operation and maintenance, construction and teachers' salaries. For most of the 13 counties, the impacted areas assistance comprises a very significant portion of the education budget, and Nevada educators are unanimous in stating that they cannot operate their education programs at the same high level without a continuation of the program.

They are equally unanimous in their observation that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will in no way fill the void which would be created by approval of the proposal to slash the

impact program.

To illustrate the feelings of local educators on this most important matter, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from some of the many letters I have received from Nevada school superintendents and other Nevada educators be included in the Record at this point:

It is an error to assume that funds from the Elementary and Secondary Act will compensate for Public Law 874 funds for impacted areas. Title I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary School Act call for new programs, exemplary programs and innovations in teaching which are above and beyond the present education effort in the school. The Public Law 874 funds for impacted areas are funds for basic educational needs, and, if taken away, there are no funds available to replace the reduction. As a result the schools will suffer a drastic cutback in school services.

ROBERT BEST, Superintendent, Lyon County School

Under Public Law 874, we will receive approximately \$225,000, while under the Ele-

mentary and Secondary Act of 1965 we would receive only approximately \$30,000. Also, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 expects us to expend over and above our present program, which we would be unable to do if we did not receive Public Law 874 money.

FLOYD SMALLEY,
Superintendent, Mineral County
School District.

Certainly funds accruing to school districts under impact legislation will, in no way, be supplanted by the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Act. We will all continue to need impacted funds for those areas where there is no appropriate base for tax support and maintenance of schools.

If we should lose the funds now identified to come to us under Public Law 874 it would mean the necessity of finding income from local sources, which would require a minimum of 12 cents on the tax rate of which there is presently no leeway. Add to this the fact that the school district is asking for a bond issue of \$5,200,000 for construction in the next 5 years, which, in 1967 will cost a minimum of an additional 11 cents, and you can see a rather gloomy financial picture for Elko County."

BURNELL LARSON,
Superintendent, Elko County School
District.

The idea that funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Act would supplant the losses under 874 is ridiculous. The only way funds are available under the Elementary and Secondary Act is in proposals over and above the present programs. Therefore, any curtailment of funds for operation of the present program would result in curtailment of the present program.

W.V.OLDS, Superintendent, Churchill County School District.

The Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 does not apply to the same pupils to which the impact laws apply. The impact laws are vital to many districts, and the popularity among Congressmen prompted the Federal administration to hang Public Law 89-10 in the framework of Public Law 874 to help secure its passage. Now it seems that Public Law 874 has embraced a Trojan Horse.

GEORGE E. HARRIS, Administrator, Federal Projects, Clark County School District.

The (reduced funds are) inadequate to, at the very minimum, maintain the type and standard of education we are obligated to offer the young people of this State. The funds we will receive under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will not compensate."

Superintendent, Nye County School District.

A move away from support of the impacted areas program to other Federal programs would be disadvantageous to Nevada at this time."

JAMES T. BUTLER,
Executive Secretary, Nevada State
Education Association.

MISS RACHEL CRITES, SHROVE TUESDAY PANCAKE RACE CHAM-PION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I take special pleasure in joining my distinguished colleague from Kansas in praising the achievement of Miss Rachel Crites—the new champion in the traditional Shrove Tuesday pancake race.

Those of us who are continually on the run might well take note of this young lady's prowess. For on Tuesday last, she sprinted a 415-yard course in 1 minute 4.5 seconds, flipping a pancake in her skillet along the way.

Her time set a new record in the event held each year in Liberal, Kans., and

Olney, England.

The 18-year-old lady, an aircraft plant receptionist, proved her groundspeed and ability with a skillet were more than equal to the occasion, considering that Miss Crites has given Kansas the edge in this 17-year event, with a total of 9 victories.

OREGON SMALL BUSINESS EXPORT PROGRAM COULD BE A MODEL FOR THE NATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would like to invite attention to the outstanding work being done in my State to bridge the gap between theory and practice in

stimulating exports,
An article in the January 17 issue of International Commerce magazine discusses a recent short course on exporting which was held in Oregon's Willamette Valley. It was organized through the cooperative efforts of the U.S. Department of Commerce; Mr. Willem Winter, head of the international department of Portland's First National Bank; Ray Teal, of the Oregon State University's cooperative extension service, and other Oregon businessmen.

As a result of thorough groundwork by the university's local extension agents, the audience which attended the session included more than 80 small business manufacturing firms, less than onehalf of which had ever exported.

The consequences of this program were noteworthy. The article reports that on the following day, four businessmen requested specific information to enable them to get started marketing their products in the export trade.

As the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] has pointed out to this body many times, about one-half of our States border the oceans and the seaways, and thus are in a position to benefit directly from the development of international trade. In addition, exports of U.S. merchandise serve high national purposes by contributing to the balance of payments and thus strengthening the dollar at home and abroad.

Our Government has been advocating export expansion for some time and the Senate Small Business Committee has since 1959 actively encouraged the small business community to take further advantage of the new world of opportunity. Since small firms constitute 94 percent of the country's manufacturing and probably even a greater percentage of its agricultural enterprise, expanding small business exports appears to hold a significant potential for both private and public benefit.

However, to bring home to businesses at the grassroots the tools and information which they need to actually enter international trade is a difficult task. Therefore, in my opinion, meetings such as the Willamette Valley course, which

combined high qualities of organization and execution, offer great promise of

being able to do this job.

I heartily commend the Department of Commerce and the Oregonians involved for the success of their program, and hope and advocate that it will serve as a model for many other programs throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-sent that the article from the Department of Commerce magazine be printed for the information of all concerned fol-

lowing my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SESSIONS ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE HAD COUNTY AGENTS AS RECRUITERS-COOPERA-TIVE EFFORTS OF FIELD OFFICE, BANK, UNI-VERSITY EXTENSION OFFICIALS FOCUS ATTEN-TION ON ADVANTAGES OF TRADING ABROAD

Thanks largely to four Oregon county extension agents, the recent Willamette Valley International Business Short Course tracted to its opening session just the kind of student body its sponsors had sought. More than 80 small manufacturing firms, other businessmen, county commissioners and farmers were represented at the first of several sessions scheduled throughout the

The course was meant particularly to reach the small Oregon businessman interested in exporting but needing the impetus for the first step. Officials of the Depart-ment of Commerce field office in Portland, the First National Bank of Oregon's international department and the State university's cooperative extension service organized the course, determined to take the information to the people and not end up with experts talking to one another. The extension agents, each thoroughly familiar with his county, pitched in as recruiters.

As a result, the audience included a majority of people who had never exported.

POTENTIAL PROFITS

Ray Teal, marketing specialist with the service and a member of the Regional Export Expansion Council, opened the first session, making the farm segment of the audience feel right at home.

He was followed by Lloyd Porter, international trade specialist with the Commerce Department, who pointed out that the U.S. merchandise shipments abroad have doubled

since 1950.

Willem Winter, assistant vice president for international banking at the First National Bank, explained methods for assuring payment when merchandise is sold overseas.

ASIAN MARKET

George Nakata, Pacific Supply Cooperative at Portland, cited Japan as a large and growing market for U.S. goods and pointed out that 67 percent of exports through the Ore-gon Customs District go to Asia with the major portion to Japan.

Freight forwarders were represented by V. Plimpton, of Harper, Robinson & Co., who outlined some ways in which exporters can ship merchandise without the usual headaches, through delegation of the

job to a freight forwarder.

The field office reported that on the day following the session, four businessmen inquired after specific information to allow them to get started marketing products internationally.

REPORT ON ACTIVITY UNDER THE ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate will recall that on Good Friday, March 27, 1964, a tragic earthquake and seismic wave struck south-central Alaska, leaving some 115 persons dead and causing hundreds of millions of dollars worth of damage. Approximately half of the State's population lived in the stricken area, and the property in it constituted over half of Alaska's tax base.

Proportionately, no State of the Union ever suffered such devastation from a natural disaster.

The Federal Government moved swiftly to aid the State and its citizens in their hour of need. We in Congress promptly passed S. 2772, an emergency relief measure, which I had the honor of sponsoring, to aid the State and its public agencies. This measure became Public Law 88-311.

Then, to aid the State and our fellow citizens in the long, difficult task of rebuilding and rehabilitation, we enacted into law S. 2881, a far-reaching measure based on the findings and recommendations of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission, of which the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, Senator Anderson, was chairman. This measure became Public Law 88-451, and I ask, Mr. President, that a report on activities and attainments under this law appear at this point in the RECORD. This report was transmitted to Congress by President Johnson, and I ask that the President's letter of transmittal precede the text of the report.

Mr. President, all of us can echo President Johnson when he describes the achievements under this law as "a tribute to the Congress, to the individual citizens of the State, and to the thousands of State and Federal personnel who worked so diligently following the disaster."

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> THE WHITE HOUSE, Washington, February 16, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, President of the Senate,

Washington, D.C. DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to transmit a report of activity under authority of Public Law 88-451, describing the ef-

forts of five Federal departments and agencies to assist in the recovery of Alaska fol-lowing the earthquake of March 27, 1964. The act, entitled "1964 Amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act" was designed to

speed reconstruction of the areas devastated by the earthquake.

This report covers the period from July 1, 1965, through December 31, 1965. It clearly indicates that most of the actions authorized by Public Law 88-451 had been completed prior to this 6-month period. Only about \$8 million was furnished through the grant and loan programs authorized by the act, while the total cumulative amount during the 18 months the amendments have been in effect approximates \$60 million. Even this latter figure represents only a small part of the total re-covery programs provided by the Federal Government under the various disaster relief authorities.

As of this date, more than \$344 million in total Federal aid has been provided for the State, its communities, and its people. Of this amount nearly \$169 million has been in the form of direct grants. More

than \$93 million was provided in the form of loans to individuals, business concerns, and other organizations. The balance represents the cost of repairs to damaged Federal facilities.

It is a tribute to the Congress, to the individual citizens of the State, and to the thousands of State and Federal personnel who worked so diligently following the disaster that Alaska has today substantially recovered from the earthquake that devastated her cities less than 2 years ago.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THIRD SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CON-GRESS-PUBLIC LAW 88-451-"1964 AMEND-MENTS TO THE ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

This report, required by section 7 of Public Law 88-451, covers actions taken by the Federal agencies under authority of the act during the period from July 1, 1965, through December 31, 1965.

Section 21 of the Alaska Omnibus Act, 73 Stat. 145 (1959), 48 U.S.C. prec. 21 nt., was amended to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make emergency fund expenditures which would provide more liberal Federal assistance to Alaska for the repair or reconstruction of earthquake-damaged highways in the Federal-aid highway system. An increase in the Federal contribution was authorized. This increase in Federal cost was limited to \$15 million.

Action taken: Between July 1 and December 31, 1965, the Department of Commerce confined its action in Alaska under Public Law 88-451 to one project. It authorized construction of 3.37 miles of the Seward-Anchorage Highway in the vicinity of Turnagain Arm. The project cost \$1,886,000, of which \$849,077 was financed from Public Law 88-451 funds. This raised to \$5,930,931 the amount of such funds that were allotted for repair of Alaskan highways and bridges damaged by the March 27, 1964, earthquake.

Section 51 was added to the Alaska Omnibus Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to:

(a) Compromise or release part or all of a borrower's indebtedness under programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration in Alaska and refinance outstanding indebtedness of applicants in Alaska who suffered earthquake damage or loss and wish to repair or rebuild dwellings or farm buildings or, when necessary, to purchase new building sites.

Action taken: Two loans totaling \$11,500 were made under section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 for the purpose of refinancing outstanding indebtedness.

(b) Compromise or release indebtedness under program administered by the Rural Electrification Administration in Alaska where borrowers suffered damage or loss as a result of the earthquake.

Action taken: No actions have been taken by REA under the authorities of this act. Borrowers are being assisted within the authority of the Rural Electrification Act and at present it appears that no action under the Alaska Omnibus Act will be required.

Section 52, added to the Alaska Omnibus Act, provided authority for the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to compromise or release a part or all of any obligation under the public facility loan program where the facility securing the obligation had been damaged.

Action taken: All necessary compromise and release actions possible under this section were accomplished during 1964.

Section 53 authorizes the Housing Home Finance Administrator to enter into contracts for grants not exceeding \$25 million for disaster-related urban renewal projects in Alaska, including open land projects. This authority is in addition to and separate from grant authorization contained in other acts, and provides that the Administrator may increase the capital grants under this authority up to 90 percent of the net project costs.

Action taken: The following summarizes, in tabular form, the status of projects which were financed under provisions of this section, as of December 31, 1965:

and a new place on the stable business to a new our part of sitting on the stable project of the stable projec	Cumulative capital grants		July to Dec. 31, 1965, capital grants	
	Approved	Disbursed	Approved	Disbursed
Total.	\$24, 945, 978	\$5, 449, 176	House, here	\$5, 449, 176
Anchorage R-20(e). Kodiak R-19(c) Seldovia R-281(d). Seward R-21(c).	10, 000, 000 6, 132, 765 3, 538, 034 1, 511, 753	1, 490, 032 2, 262, 990 716, 452 277, 784	21 7 1 12 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	1, 490, 032 2, 262, 990 716, 452 277, 784
Valdez: R-22(e) R-25	2, 171, 439 1, 591, 987	701, 918	3.000000	701, 918

The following provides highlights regarding selected projects financed under section 53:

R-19(c) Kodiak: Formal acceptance of the stage 1 site improvements, completed under the S. S. Mullen contract, and administered by the U.S. Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks was accomplished and transferred to the city of Kodiak on October 29, 1965. The work included land fill, utilities, storm drainage, sidewalks and the paving of Marine Way. As of November 1965, the new ferry dock was 50 percent complete.

R-20(c) Anchorage downtown: The contract for buttressing a 10-block length of hillside north of Fourth Avenue was awarded in December 1965, to Stewart-Erickson Co. of Seattle for \$4,716,437. Plans call for earthfilled buttresses; subdrains and grading; curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, storm and sanitary sewer systems; a water distribution system; street lighting, etc. All unsuitable material at the base of the slide area will be removed and filled with compacted gravel. Completion date is set for 600 calendar days after the notice to proceed. Approximately 12 acres of land have been acquired by the Alaska State Housing Authority (ASHA) which is the urban renewal agency.

R-21(c) Seward: In October 1965, a contract was awarded to Rogers Construction Co. and Babler Bros., Anchorage and Portland contracting firms, for road construction, street paving, curb, gutter, and sidewalk installation in the small boat harbor and D Street. Water and sewer mains will be laid in the small boat harbor area. Total estimated cost of the work is \$319,530 with completion scheduled for October 1966. Improvements to the small boat harbor will help in rebuilding the city's tourist industry. Approximately 2 acres of land have been acquired by ASHA.

Valdez R-22(c) Old Townsite and R-25(c) Mineral Creek: In the Old Townsite urban renewal area, acquisition is approximately 40 percent complete and relocation is geared to how quickly residential construction proceeds in the Mineral Creek urban renewal area. Families are expected to move to the new townsite during this calendar year.

In the Mineral Creek urban renewal area, out of a total of 250 lots, 174 residential and 4 commercial lots have been sold. Construction of an elementary school was completed in 1965 and construction of a high school is almost finished. A State highway complex is nearing completion and the contract for construction of a mental hospital was recently awarded.

Section 54 allows a 30-year maturity period for Small Business Administration loans made to repair or replace earthquake-damaged dwellings in Alaska.

Action taken: During this reporting period, SBA approved 69 loans to homeowners in Alaska in the total dollar amount of \$1.595.865.

Section 55 of the act authorizes the Chief of Engineers to make such modifications to previously authorized civil works projects in Alaska adversely affected by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves as he finds necessary to meet changed conditions and to provide for current and reasonably prospective requirements of the communities they serve.

Action taken: Pursuant to the authority of the act, modifications were made to the authorized small boat harbors at Homer, Seward, Valdez, and Cordova. The Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1965 provided \$2 million for this purpose. Actions taken at these harbors were as follows:

Homer Small Boat Harbor: The modification provides for enlarging the harbor area by 6.2 acres, a change in the existing breakwater, and extension of the north breakwater. Construction funds in the amount of \$640,000 were allotted in October 1964. The work was placed under contract on November 5, 1964, and completed in July 1965.

Seward Small Boat Harbor: The modification provides for enlarging the anchorage by 12.45 acres. Construction funds in the amount of \$400,000 were allotted in October 1964. The enlargement was part of a dredging contract. Under the contract, the small boat basin, the city dock, and the Alaska Rallroad areas were dredged. The final increment for the expansion phase dredging of the small boat basin was completed in November 1965.

Valdez Small Boat Harbor: The modification provides for enlarging the anchorage area by 7 acres. Construction funds in the amount of \$420,000 were allotted in October 1964. The work was placed under contract on October 28, 1964. Final inspection of the completed basin was held on June 9, 1965, and the facilities turned over to the city.

Cordova Small Boat Harbor: The modification provides for enlarging the mooring area by about 10 acres. Construction funds in the amount of \$540,000 were allotted in October 1964. Enlargement of the small boat harbor was completed in May 1965.

Section 56. This section authorized the HHFA Administrator to purchase securities and obligations of, or to make loans to, the State of Alaska to finance any part of the programs needed to carry out reconstruction activities in Alaska related to the 1964 earthquake or subsequent seismic waves, or to complete capital improvements begun prior to the earthquake. The amount of purchase or loan is limited to \$25 million. The projects covered under this assistance program are of the community facility type, and the program is administered by the Community Facilities Administration, a constituent agency of HHFA (HUD).

Action taken: On January 7, 1965, the State of Alaska accepted the offer of the U.S. Government to purchase \$25 million worth of bonds, at 3% percent interest, as authorized under this section. This would include \$19.5 million in series B bonds, with maturity between 1970-94 and \$5.5 million of series A bonds with maturity between 1955-2004.

This guarantee has made it possible for the State to sell temporary notes at a reasonable rate of interest, and funds obtained from these sales have financed recovery programs in Anchorage, Valdez, Cordova, Kodiak, Seldovia, and Seward.

The following describes the status of these

two separate issues:

Nineteen and one-half million dollars in series B bonds: There have been no further developments with respect to these bonds since February 3, 1965, when the State of Alaska sold bond anticipation notes totaling \$19,104,100 at 2.29 percent. The supporting bond issue must be delivered to the ultimate purchasers not later than October 1, 1968.

Five and one-half million dollars, series A bonds: As indicated in the report for the previous period, judicial determinations were required before this part of the loan could be finalized. We are advised by bond counsel engaged by the State-Hawkins, Delafield & Wood-that action to secure determination as to the validity of the sale of these bonds was filed in the Superior Court of Alaska in September 1965. Briefs have been filed by both appellants and appellees in the Supreme Court of the State of Alaska. Bond counsel reports that notice was received on November 26, 1965, that the case is scheduled for oral argument on February 1 and 2, 1966, in the Supreme Court of Alaska.

Section 57. This section provides Federal financial assistance to the State of Alaska to support a mortgage indemnification program to retire or adjust outstanding home mortgage obligations upon one- to four-family homes that were severely damaged or destroyed by the 1964 earthquake or subsequent seismic wave. Authorization for a \$5.5 million grant by the Federal Government is established, to be matched by an equal amount to be contributed by the State of Alaska. Federal responsibilities under this program have been delegated to the Federal National Mortgage Association, a constituent agency of HHFA (HUD).

Action taken: As of June 30, 1965, it was reported that the formal Alaska mortgage adjustment plan was in the course of being amended to change the date before which all claims must be filed from July 1, 1965, to July 1, 1966. On July 6, 1965, the executed amendment was received by Federal National Mortgage Association, the agency representing the HHFA Administrator in the performance of duties delegated to him by the President in Executive Orders 11184 and 11196. The amendment had been executed by the HHFA Administrator on June 24, 1965, and by the Governor of Alaska on June 29, 1965.

The suit in the State courts of Alaska testing the constitutional validity of the State's prospective issue of series C bonds for financing the State's contribution to the Alaska mortgage adjustment fund has proceeded to final decree in the trial court. The decree affirmed that the Alaska mortgage adjustment plan, the amendment thereto, the special session laws of Alaska implementing the plan, and the program of borrowing and expending money of the State, authorized pursuant to said plan and said statutes, are legal, constitutional and valid in every respect. The decree was entered on July 13, 1965.

An appeal to the Supreme Court of Alaska has been perfected and it is now expected that the matter will be considered and adjudicated by the supreme court in early 1966.

Regulations of the Alaska Mortgage Adjustment Agency, with amendments as required by the HHFA Administrator, are to be approved and issued when the plan is put into operation. Two things remain as prerequisites before the plan can be put into operation. They are (1) an appropriation by Congress and (2) a favorable ruling by the Supreme Court of Alaska.

THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE AND VIETNAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Reverend Duncan Howlett, minister of the All Souls Unitarian Church of Washington, recently preached an able sermon on the American conscience and Vietnam. Mr. Howlett is in no sense a war hawk. He appreciates the feelings of many conscientious Americans that we should withdraw in order to reduce immediate bloodshed. But he correctly points out that if North Vietnam were permitted to take over South Vietnam by force, a reign of terror would follow. Santayana once observed that those who refused to learn from history were condemned to repeat it. This, in my judgment, applies to the present situation. To allow the police state of communism to sweep on unchecked is to reenact a second Munich and to assist in a cumulative ascent to power of tyrannical forces.

Dr. Howlett is to be commended for his vigorous and brave defense of freedom. I believe that as the issues become more clearly understood, the liberal and religious forces of the Nation will more and more agree with President Johnson's program for South Vietnam:

First. To resist and root out Communist attempts to take over South Viet-

nam by force and terror.

Second. To resist efforts to widen and deepen the war and to bomb the city of Hanoi. This would kill tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children, set the public opinion of the world against us, and run the danger of bringing first China and then Russia into the war. If this last development were to happen, a nuclear war would almost inevitably result.

Third. As fast as territory is cleared from the Communists, to introduce land reform, the furnishing of seed and work animals.

In any event, Dr. Howlett's sermon is worthy of careful reading. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE AND VIETNAM

There are two sermons I have owed you for a long time, one on the sex revolution, which comes next week; the other on Vietnam, to which we come today. Few questions have troubled me as much during my years in the ministry and none any more than these two. There is no unanimity in the congregation on either issue. On both, feelings run high and convictions lie very deep. According to our tradition I shall not attempt to resolve either question on your behalf. Having thought each through as far as I can, I set the result before you in the hope that it may be of some use to you as the many people with whom I have talked and the many things I have read have helped

Perhaps never in our history have we, the people of the United States, wrestled with our conscience as people as we are doing today over the war in Vietnam. To begin with, it is not even a war in the technical sense that it has never been declared. Yet, because of the size of our military commitment, everybody, with full justification, speaks of the struggle as a war. Moreover,

we are a peace-loving people and we always have been. We have our hawks and doves, to be sure, but as in the kingdom of birds, the doves far, far outnumber the hawks. Our blood curdles at pictures of wounded and dead Americans, wounded and dead Vietnamese, North, South and the Vietcong. We cannot bear to look at the pictures of wounded children, helpless victims of a conflict of which they know nothing.

As civilians, safely at home, comfortably housed, secure from ambush and terror, we nevertheless cannot quite escape the war, among other reasons just because it is not a war, officially speaking. With no censorship as in wartime, the news media, in particular the TV cameras, constantly thrust the horrors of the conflict before us. The Second World War, infinitely worse, at least in magnitude, was carefully screened from us at the time, except insofar as the suffering it caused could be used to inflame our passions against the enemy. But now for the first time we are permitted to see what war is like while it is going on, to know what American soldiers look like when they have been hit by enemy fire, and to see pictures of little children maimed for life by our machines of destruction. We see, and we turn away, our conscience as a people seared by the wrong that we do.

"In God's name stop it," cried a group of clergymen and others in a New York Times ad 2 years ago, after seeing some of these pictures. "Get out of Vietnam," cried another group unable to tolerate any longer for any reason American bombing of Vietnam villages and American killing, even of Vietnong soldiers. Since American soldiers first moved from advising to fighting, the call for a ceasefire has mounted steadily. Now we hear it in Congress as well as in teach-ins and peace marches across the land. "Negotiate. To the peace table. Now." And this cry, echoing up and down the United States, echoes and reechoes around the world.

Except for a few hawks who would like to tackle China before she becomes a fullfledged nuclear power, most of the American people agree with these sentiments. We want a world as peaceful and as prosperous as our own country. We believe such a world is possible. But we believe that it can come only as the democratic ideal itself is made real among the nations of the earth. As Clarence Streit reminded us before the Second World War, democracy has brought peace wherever it has gone. Wars of aggression always come from tyranny and dictatorship. The people, given the chance to make their views known, demand peace. The truth of Streit's observation has been demonstrated over and over since he first made it 30 years

But the two ideals, democracy and peace, are not necessarily consistent. They were not when we entered World War I: they were not when we entered World War II, or the Korean war, and they are not now. wise we should have no problem in Vietnam. If peace and democracy required the same course of action, we should call an immediate ceasefire and go forthwith to the conference table. But this is not the case in Vietnam. Neither the Vietcong nor North Vietnam accept the democratic ideal. South Vietnam does, although even there it is an ideal far being fully realized. If the Vietcong and North Vietnam took over South Vietnam, as they would do if American forces were withdrawn, world democracy would shrink and world dictatorship would advance by that much. This is the American dilemma. In Vietnam today the two ideals of peace and freedom dictate two quite different courses

Most of the argument raging about the Vietnam war has to do with detail: to bomb or not to bomb; the effect bombing has for and against our cause; when, where, how often to bomb, with what kind, and so on.

Should we return to the Geneva accord of 1954? Should there be a new Geneva conference? or some other kind of peace talks with Hanoi? or the National Liberation Front? with whom, on what, when, where, under what conditions, if any, and so on. The proposals can be numbered by the dozen. Should our policy be one of containment? or enclaves? or all-out attack with invasion of North Vietnam? Shall we use nuclear weapons? What about the U.N.? the efforts of the Pope and other intermediaries?

I would not minimize the importance of any of these considerations. Decisions of many kinds must be made and in great detail. But if the average citizen like you and me is to talk intelligently on these questions, he has first to make up his mind on the central issues. Having done so, he can then more profitably move to the debate on the specifics. Do we choose peace or do we choose freedom? Here the battle on the facts begins and the basic issue is soon forgotten. Those who choose peace say that it will eventually lead to freedom, and those who choose freedom say it can only be established by driving out the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. What is the truth?

The administration has chosen freedom and has been pursuing it by military intervention of ever increasing size, scope, and cost in human lives on both sides. If you project where we are to be 5 years hence from the distance we have come in the last 5 years, you might find us at war with China. Is this the intent of the Government? The American people want to know.

We are aware that there is a political and social revolution in process in Vietnam today and that this revolution is but an aspect of the movement of peoples everywhere from traditional cultures, centuries old, into the commercial, industrial, technological civilization of the 20th century. In Vietnam and everywhere, this movement is accompanied by an equally basic political turnover—the emergence of millions from colonialism to self-government, whether by democracy or dictatorship. We are aware, too, that our involvement in Vietnam has no meaning apart from our involvement in the world struggle for power.

struggle for power.

The President has seemed to say on more than one occasion that because of this, he and the military had a virtual blank check to do what they thought necessary in Vietnam. He has steadfastly refused to say how far he would go. But the clamor of public opinion in the teach-ins, peace marches, and public statements, backed up by the Senate hearings, demanded that the President more sharply define his objectives and the methods he will use to achieve them.

It is all to the good. The American people on the whole want to get off the war escalator. It has, they feel, gone far enough. Only the war hawks, of whom there are always some around, want to go to Peiping.

Only the war hawks, of whom there are always some around, want to go to Pelping.
But our military presence in Vietnam
raises a deeper question. Even though we
escalate the war no further: even though
we adopt General Gavin's and Ambassador
Kennan's enclave formula, have we any right to be in Vietnam at all? Can we support this war in any moral sense? What is the national conscience on the more basic issue of war itself? We can answer this question, like the others, only by arguing it out with each other as we are now doing. In my mind the debate that has been going on for several years, now mounting to a climax through the nationally televised hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is a great thing. For in this debate, as in all things, we are united as a people, not because we agree as to the course we should follow, but because we agree on the ideals in accordance with which we shall decide what to do.

One of the favorite ways of attempting to solve the problem is by historical analogy, in

particular with the thirties, when Hitler was rapidly gaining strength, and Europe had to decide whether to let him go on gobbling up territory or to risk war in an attempt to stop him. From the second alternative Europe turned away, for the suffering, death and destruction of the First World War were still too vivid in the minds of everyone. There was much talk even then that another war would bring an end to civilization. Almost any alternative seemed better than to resort to arms.

Most observers quite properly dismiss this analogy as too facile. But to reject the Munich accord analogy is not to dismiss all history as worthless in this instance or any other. Surely history can help us to profit by our mistakes. And certainly it can help us to understand current thought trends by tracing them back to their roots. In my mind, the present torrent of declarations by churchmen, educators, and others on the war in Vietnam is understandable only in terms of the background out of which they come. The most immediate and therefore the most cbvious of these origins is the civil rights movement.

The remarkable involvement of the clergy, and to a lesser degree students, educators, and others, in the civil rights movement in the last 3 or 4 years did two things. It gave thousands of individuals a chance to participate actively in social change, when heretofore they had been, at best, commentators upon it. Secondly, it gave them a sense of power. No one doubts that the physical participation in freedom marches by men and women from all walks of life had much to do with the progress we have made in civil rights legislation and practice. The peace-now people who were active in the civil rights movement naturally feel that their views on Vietnam might be as successfully advanced by peace marches as their views on race were advanced by freedom marches.

There is, however, a profound difference beneath the superficial similarity between the two movements. The civil rights protests were directed against an intransigent government by an oppressed segment of our people. When the protests failed, as they did at first, citizens who were not oppressed began to join in the demonstrations. They joined in ever greater numbers until at last the Government began to mend its ways. By last year, solid citizens were marching in America's streets for freedom for the Negro, who would have been appalled at such an idea

not long before.

The Vietnam protests are different. To say this is not to deny the right to stage peace protest demonstrations. But it is to emphasize the fact that these are not protests made in the streets, because they can be heard nowhere else. The demand for civil rights went almost unheeded until the American people took to the streets in great numbers. This is not true of American foreign policy in Vietnam. Protests against it constantly been heard, weighed, and considered in high places. The organized demand that we get out of Vietnam goes back far beyond the civil rights movement. It has its roots in the peace movement itself as it emerged among clergyman and others in this country during the latter part of the 19th and early 20th centuries. This was the period of the establishment of the Hague Peace Conferences, and the International Court of Justice. At that time many ministers took the position publicly that all war was wrong. Many held to that position when war broke out in Europe in 1914. But when the United States became one of the belligerents in 1917, almost to a man the clergy repudiated their former position and led the call for the raising of arms and men to defeat "the Beast of Berlin," in that instance Kaiser Wilhelm II.

When the war was over and the world had been made "safe for democracy," in

Woodrow Wilson's words, the denouement came, and it was shattering. The war to end war had not brought war to an end, for fighting continued in various parts of the world. Neither was the world safe for democracy, for communism and dictatorship was now on the march. Nor was it any longer so clear that the Kaiser alone had brought on the war. Historians began to point out that the economic and political rivalry of France, Germany and England, and to a lesser degree Italy, Austria and Russia, had been basic factors in bringing the nations to a test of arms. Many of the atrocity stories that had aroused the ire of the Americans were shown to have been pure propaganda. The complete turnaround of the clergy was then documented in a biting volume, "Preachers Present Arms" by Ray Abrams. Many a minister was truly ashamed to think that he had been so easily led to abandon his principles. In a wave of repentance, many signed peace pledges renouncing all war as an evil in and of itself. As a result, during the years when Hitler strode to power in Europe, the American Protestant clergy, to a marked degree, took the high-principled but simplistic position that all war is wrong. They called, not for resistance to nazism, but for negotiation looking toward keeping the peace.

The revelations following the Second World

The revelations following the Second World War were opposite to those that followed the first. We learned in the late forties that the worst atrocity stories we had heard about nazism were not half as bad as the truth. Far from being the victims of propaganda as we had been in World War I, during World War II we had neither known nor believed when we heard the depths of bestiality to

which the Nazis had sunk.

These revelations had a profound effect upon the group we used to call the absolute And again there was a change of pacifists. heart. There were few now to say that war against another Hitler might not be justified. It is one of the dogmas of our ageone to which I fully subscribe—that the Nazi regime was the personification of evil, and that since it employed force to seek its ends. only force could have deposed it. Therefore such a war is justified. In this I wholly concur. As a result we are more sophisticated today, and there are few to say that they would never fight a war under any circumstances. What the Nazis actually did virtually destroyed the power of the pacifist arguments of the 1930's.

Nevertheless we hear today the same simplistic approach to the problem of peace we heard before the First and Second World Wars. Today again we hear the demand for peace on the part of high-minded people who find it intolerable to be citizens of a nation that visits the horrors of war upon another people. There might be war that could be justified, they say, but this is not one of them.

them.

I share their sense of shame and guilt. I face the fact, as we all must, that every bomb that is dropped in Vietnam, I drop; every child that is hurt, I hurt; every vilthat is destroyed, I destroy. I settled for that back in the thirties, when in the face of the rising Nazi menace, I parted company with the pacifists forever. I first faced the fact then, and I hold to it today, that my guilt is not lessened by becoming a conscientious objector, and my hands are not kept clean because I personally do not wield a knife or discharge a gun against the enemy. While I enjoy the peace and safety of this country, I kill and destroy with the Armed Forces that keep this country safe from subversion at home and safe from invasion from abroad.

Can I then assuage my guilt for the havoc wrought by American arms in Vietnam by seeking to force the administration to terminate the war? Like everyone else, I devoutly desire peace, and think we should pursue it by every means possible. But here, it seems to me, history does have something to say to us. It can remind us that the simple way of peace was wrong in 1916. It was wrong in 1939, and I would say that for the same reason it is wrong in 1966. If peace is right now, then we never had any business in Vietnam in the first place. Some say we didn't. How you resolve this question depends upon your view of the role of the United States in the contemporary world. Are you one who thinks we should stay home and mind our own business? should we take a hand in the political affairs of the world? Should we withdraw from Germany? From our military bases around the world? If not, then why from Vietnam? The one question we must answer is: Where shall we take our stand for freedom, even if we have to fight? Where shall we say to those who would subvert a nation through terror: Beyond this point you shall not go.

We would all say it, I suppose—or almost all of us-should terrorists appear in the United States, whose purpose was to claim this country for the Communists, the America Firsters, or the Ku Klux Klan. We have asserted the right to do this in Europe, and there have been few to complain chiefly perhaps because we have not had to fight in order to do it. Do we draw the line there? At the moment we are saying to the Vietcong in Vietnam, "This land you shall not bend to your will by terrorizing its people." The origin of the liberation front in the revolt against the Diem regime does not alter the situation that exists now. The justice of the cause that brought the liberation front into being does not justify either the presence or the methods of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese in South Vietnam

We have chosen freedom in Vietnam rather than peace. But the trouble is, it has never been really clear that our choice was freedom for the Vietnamese. It has never been clear that we were doing more there than fending off the ultimate Communist threat to ourselves, with little or no thought for the Vietnamese themselves. To many, it looked as though we were trying to impose a new kind of colonialism on Vietnam as intolerable to most Americans as to the Vietnamese. As the weeks and months went by, as the war steadily escalated and the bombing of North Vietnam increased, stopped, and began again, the conscience of American people was increasingly troubled.

Then came the Honolulu declaration. If, as that declaration stated, the reconstruction of the economy of Vietnam is our aim, if a free and independent Vietnam is our goal, then we have a role to play in that unhappy country that we can defend on prin-

ciple and point to with pride.

The administration would have been in a far stronger position if it had formulated these policies and declared them definitively long ago, rather than now, as it appears, under the duress of an aroused public opinion. But the administration has now stated its objectives in Vietnam and now we know what they are: (1) to drive out the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, and (2) to help the South Vietnamese to live in freedom, in peace, and in prosperity. We have long been engaged in both endeavors and our growing success may be seen in the increasing number of Vietcong defectors now coming over to the South Vietnam side. These defections show that the Vietnamese want what we all want—a chance to live in peace under a regime stable enough to maintain

We have now to remain true to these two specific goals, whatever the cost. While the military are driving the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong out, let us proceed with our program of hospitals, schools, dams, and factories. This program we can support with all our moral conviction. For every soldier we send to Vietnam, let us send a worker for AID or one of the several voluntary agencies now helping there. For every rifle, let us send a plow, for every round of ammunition a set of handtools. Let the buildup of arms be matched by the buildup of econ-Let an ever-widening stable social omy. Let an ever-widening stable social order be established in the wake of our military successes. Let the world see by what we do that we are in Vietnam, not for our own good primarily, but for the good of the free world as a whole.

If the Honolulu declaration is our blueprint, then our conscience as a people is set free again. In the light of that statement, amplified by testimony at the Senate hearings last week, we can support administration policies, despite our abhorrence of war and the suffering it brings. We can do so because we have been offered a course of action dictated by harsh reality, but guided by the humanitarian ideals for which we as a people, have always stood. In Vietnam today, as so often in the past, we have chosen freedom, even in the face of war. We have done it because we believe it to be the only road to a final lasting peace.

Prayer: God of men and of nations, lead us to the right whence both peace and freedom flow. Amen.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, at this time I wish to state my opposition to any reduction in the school milk program.

I feel it is an efficient but effective way of helping provide a soundly nourished

youth in this country.

In the past decade attention has been brought to the need for a healthy young America. We have initiated all manner of programs, on Capitol Hill and elsewhere, aimed at improving the overall physical condition of the Nation's youngsters.

The school milk program has certainly contributed to this.

For whether we like it or not, too often youths not considered financially needy are nevertheless nutritionally needy. Cash in the pocket does not always mean calories in the body.

The cost of this program is not of such magnitude to forestall other major programs of importance. The program, in fact, is one expenditure where there is definitely great value received for the dollars spent.

According to the President's proposal, the current appropriation of \$103 million for the school milk program across the Nation would be reduced \$21 mil-

lion-an 80-percent cutback.

The Department of Agriculture estimates for this year indicate this program will help provide 36.6 million half pints of milk for Kansas schoolchildren. Under next year's proposal this would be reduced drastically-and thousands of children would be excluded from it.

Looking at it financially, it would cost Kansas taxpayers nearly \$1 million in additional revenue to maintain the program as it now operates.

Here we have a program that is operating effectively and without problems,

and it should be retained.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERN-MENT EFFORTS: POLLUTION

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the President yesterday called upon the Congress to do something about restoring the quality of the American environment. It was a strong message, but it certainly did not exaggerate the urgency of this need. It would be impossible for that need to be overstated.

The deterioration of our environment has become an extremely serious matter. It is something we may have been able to ignore or overlook in the past, but it is a problem we can ignore no longer.

For we now possess means to eliminate the human race. We normally think of this awesome possibility in terms of the atomic bomb. Thousands of words have been written and spoken about the dangers inherent in our use of atomic fission. But the poet who said that the world will end, "not with a bang, but a whimper," he may have been more prophetic than he knew.

The simple fact is that we now possess means more insidious than the atomic bomb to eliminate ourselves from the face of the earth. More insidious because they are less dramatic, less obvious, more pervasive, more subtle, more a part of our daily existence. The automobile, the powerplant, the diesel engine, and the rest of our industrial complex, as it expands to meet the needs of increased population, threatens our very existence.

If it is to be used wisely, and by the very nature of water itself the attack upon pollution must be carried on in the context of a unified water conservation program. The Department of the Interior has traditionally been concerned with the wise conservation and development of our water resources. Assigning the war on pollution to the Department will complete the gearing up process. The full, comprehensive, and concentrated fight to clean up our rivers can now begin.

REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COM-MISSION ON INTERGOVERN-MENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the recently issued seventh annual report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has been receiving considerable attention around the country. The Commission is a bipartisan group charged with exploring problems and relations among Federal, State, and local governments. It has been my pleasure to serve as one of the three Senate members of the Commission since its inception, along with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

One of the major dilemmas of our Federal system as highlighted in the recent report of the Commission is described in a recent article in the Idaho Evening Statesman by Mr. John Corlett. He pleads for greater compassion by the Congress toward the States in the light of the efforts they are making to meet their problems. I ask unanimous consent to place the text of the article at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. as follows:

[From the Idaho Evening Statesman, Feb. 1, 19661

STATES MUST SEEK TO BE PARTNERS IN FED-ERALLY AIDED PROGRAMS

(By John Corlett)

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was created 7 years ago by Congress with the avowed purpose of creating a climate of cooperation among National, State, and local units of government.

It was hoped that the Commission would serve as the forum for strengthening the federal system whereby there would be a balance of power among the Federal. State, and local governments.

The Commission has moved strongly in this direction, but in its seventh annual report, just off the press, it notes that the last Congress made some giant steps toward federalism by which the National Government assumed greater powers. This, of course, serves to unbalance the federal system.

The report noted that the National Government, by congressional action, moved into three fields in which the States heretofore held nearly unlimited autonomy-voting rights, financing, and administration of the public schools, and law enforcement. In addition, a bill has been introduced which would place the Federal Government squarely in the field of State taxation. This would be done in the name of "interstate taxation," but the States would lose many of the powers they now hold in assessing taxes within their own borders.

The last Congress enacted some 25 grantsin-aid programs or major expansions of existing programs, including the National Government's advent into the three new fields listed above.

It is no wonder that the Commission views these steps with some alarm, particularly since they all were consummated in such a short period of time.

In the short time it has been in existence. the Commission has sought to develop studies and programs in which roles of National Government, the States, the counties, and the municipalities are clearly outlined. The Commission, by its very makeup, is not anti-Federal or anti-State. Instead its research programs are based on the assumption that in governmental fields where the Federal Government should be supreme, the States have no place in them. And conversely, if the States have unquestioned dominance in other fields, the Federal Government ought to stay out.

But there are so many fields in which all the segments of government can play their roles in a cooperative manner for the benefit of the people. The Commission has sought above all else to promote these programs in order to vitalize the federal system.

Undoubtedly, the Commission will soon be making inquiries into the three fields in which the Federal Government has ousted the States as lone administrators, with the intent of making sure that the States and the local units of government retain as much say as possible in them.

It does no good to moan that the Federal Government should not be in these three areas because the moves were made without great outcry from the States and the people themselves.

The Commission, if it is to be effective in its avowed purpose of trying to strengthen the federal system, must receive all the moral support possible from the States, the counties, and the cities.

Legislatures, county commissioners, and the city councils must begin fighting for retention of their powers and build the necessary public support for themselves. Congress listens to strongly expressed public opinion.

This doesn't mean that the States must take an "anti-Federal" stand, but they must, as the Commission's report pointed out, seek to be "real partners" in the federal system.

More importantly, they cannot look to the Federal Government exclusively for funds for public programs, no matter what they be, but must share with the Federal Government in program costs.

"If the States stand aside and do not participate in a massive financial way in these programs," the Commission said, "the problems to which the funds are directed will eventually come to be viewed as primarily a Federal responsibility."

The States have been assuming a greater responsibility in the solving of problems in this growing age of urbanization. Most States are taxing almost to their limit and are making far-reaching changes in their governmental form. This Congress must be made to understand.

BOB HOPE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, for many years, Bob Hope has been touring areas all over the world bringing laughter, entertainment, and an all-too-brief moment of pleasure to our men, who man freedom's battle stations throughout the world.

These trips have been conducted during the Christmas season at a time when all of us like to be at home with our families. With the lovely family that he has, I know it is not easy for Bob to be away. Fortunately for our troops, his wife and family are most understanding.

The Congress of the United States, of course, is very much aware of Bob's great contributions, and in 1962 enacted Public Law 87-478, authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to him in recognition of his services to the country and his work for peace. I would like to ask unanimous consent that the law be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks

As all my colleagues know, Bob's most recent trip was to southeast Asia where he entertained our young men who are doing such an outstanding job resisting Communist aggression. Joining Bob and also to be congratulated were Jerry Colonna, Les Brown and his band, Anita Bryant, Jack Jones, Peter Leeds, Kaye Stevens, Carroll Baker, Joey Heatherton, Dianna Lynn Batts, Fayard Antonio Nicholas, and Harold Lloyd Nicholas. This trip was a great success and I know it helped to convey to our fighting men the appreciation of the American people for what they are doing.

The San Diego Union editorially commented on the Christmas 1965 trip and made particular note of Bob's closing words on the Chrysler television special, which highlighted the trip. Because I believe as did the editorial that Bob's eloquent concluding statement penetrated the confusion that exists in this country regarding the role of the United States in Vietnam, I requested a complete transcript of his closing remarks so that my colleagues and the Nation might benefit from them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the San Diego Union together with the closing television remarks of Mr. Hope be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 88

Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope

Whereas moments enriched by humor are moments free from hate and conflict, and therefore valued by mankind; and

Whereas Bob Hope has given to us and to the world many such treasured moments; and

Whereas he has done so unstintingly and unselfishly, with heavy demands on his time, talent, and energy; and

Whereas his contributions over a long period of years to the morale of millions of members of the United States armed services, in addition to those of our friends and allies, have been of immediate and enduring value; and

Whereas these contributions have been made during Christmas and at other times by personal contact in countless miles of travel around the globe, to the farthest outposts manned by American youth, during times of peace and war, often under dangerous conditions and at great personal risk; and

Whereas while at home he has given firm and imaginative support to humanitarian causes of every description; and

Whereas in all this Bob Hope has rendered an outstanding service to the cause of democracy, as America's most prized "Ambassador of Good Will" throughout the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to present in the name of the people of the United States of America a gold medal of appropriate design to Bob Hope in recognition of his aforesaid services to his country and to the cause of world peace.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such a medal to be struck and furnished to the President. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,500 for this purpose.

Approved June 8, 1962.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Jan. 24, 1966]

THANKS FOR MEMORIES

About 30 years ago when Will Rogers, entertainment's early-day Art Buchwald, died in a plane crash, a fellow named Bob Hope was breaking into show business in vaudeville.

Today, Hope stands tallest among show business personalities with the GI's and ex-GI's who look back on dark days the comedian filled with laughter—World War II, the Berlin airlift, Korea, and the Vietnam war—accompanied by Johnny Grant and Jerry Colonna, who along with Hope have sacrified their holidays over the years.

Generals, the food, jungle living conditions and pretty girls all are foils, and Hope plays them like a concert-master as an almost reverent hush falls over the audience.

Bob Hope, the true American patriot, came through best, however, as he concluded his Christmas television special, filmed in Vietnam, to explain his country's reasons for being committed to battle.

The United States of America is taking a firm stand so that all of southeast Asia will not be turned into what Bob Hope terms a gigantic "cafeteria for communism."

Hope expressed the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of Americans, chiding detractors in humorist Will Rogers' style, as he

alternately praised and thanked his GI audiences for sacrifices they are making for freedom.

He articulated the feelings of all thinking Americans, extending most tastefully our gratitude to all our fighting forces for their perseverance toward a just victory over militant Communists trying to impose their will on a free people in South Vietnam.

REMARKS OF BOB HOPE

You hear a few people say, "Get out of Vietnam." Here are some of our kids who are getting out the hard way. You get a feeling of humility when you walk through these wards and say "hello" to these men.

This was Christmas Eve at the 3d field hospital at Tan Son Nhut. And I said to this boy, CWO Robert Johnston, from Gordonsville, Va.: * * "Are you all right?" And he pointed to his shot-up leg and said, "I just got my Christmas present—I'm going home." We heard none of them complain. It was a king-size study in courage.

And so, we're on our way home with exciting memories. We want to thank the Defense Department and the U.S.O. for the privilege of meeting some wonderful kids—kids who seem to be a lot more optimistic about this commitment than a lot of citizens here at home. In their everyday job of fighting this treacherous war, they know there's no alternative. They know that in this shrinking world the perimeter of war is boundless. They know that if they backed off from this fight it would leave all of Asia like a big cafeteria for the Communists to go in and pick up a country at a time. There are no reservations in their dedication. Our fighting men have confidence in the decisions of their leaders.

It's hard for them to hear the rumblings of peace over the gunfire, but when peace comes, they will welcome it. For nothing would give them greater joy than to bring the gift of freedom to the people of Vietnam.

Until then, they're ready to lay down their lives because they know how lucky we are to be Americans—and how very much we have to protect.

It made us proud that we could share our Christmas with them.

FLUORIDATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on the weekend of February 6-8, the National Dental Health Assembly sponsored a conference to encourage widespread adoption of fluoridation of public water supplies in our communities. It brought together over 400 national authorities representing public affairs, engineering, the social sciences, communications, law, public health, medicine, and dentistry.

Sixty million persons live in communities that enjoy the benefits of controlled fluoridation; yet over two-thirds of the Nation's community water supplies are still not treated. Children in fluoridated areas have up to 60 percent less tooth decay than their counterparts living in nonfluoridated communities.

Among the reports presented at the symposium, one was delivered by pollster Louis Harris. In his talk, "Controversy and Opinions," Harris analyzes the puzzling question of why community acceptance of fluoridation is discouragingly slow despite the fact that a majority of the public prefer it. Most polls, according to Harris, show roughly four-fifths of the public favoring fluoridation.

Because by every measure of public opinion as we know it, you start out with a vast majority in favor of fluoridation—81 percent have heard of fluoridation—though I must say only 56 percent think it helps teeth—another 23 percent think it purifies water. But those who do know about it prefer fluoridation. That is, they think it's desirable by a count of roughly 80 to 20. The National Opinion Research Center survey (taken late last year)—it's 84 to 16. The Gallup survey * * * there's a 76 to 24 margin for it. And among those who have fluoridation the margin rises to 7 to 1.

What pattern is followed by communities faced with the fluoridation issue? Social science research, submits Harris, has contributed to the understanding of this phenomenon.

First, a profile which I'm sure you're familiar with—people who are for fluoridation are upper-income people, people with a rising income, professionals, skilled labor, those who are politically aware and active, people who are younger in age, men, and people with children. Who are less for it? People in the lower income groups, people with static income from the white-collar groups, unskilled labor, people who aren't politically aware or active, older people, women, and those with no children.

Harris goes on to say there is "high emotion from the opposition" and "low emotional appeal" for the supporters of fluoridation. He points out that older people will always be against fluoridation because there is no obvious benefit for them. There are other resistances: the belief that it is revulsion against the scientific revolution is one. Another resistance, according to Harris, is the opportunity to contest community leadership, or to combating the "establishment." The feeling that it is too early to accept fluoridation is another point often expressed.

However emotional and intense the subject of fluoridation may be, it has thus far remained a nonpartisan issue. Harris cites a 1964 study which reveals that antifluoridation decisions were most likely to take place where local governments were nonpartisan. He goes on to say that the more partisan the government, the more likely referendums would pass.

Conversely, the more partisan the government, where you had referendums, you were likely to pass it. Meaning that those whose roots go to the political process are more likely to take on fluoridation when they know darn well they can pass it—and that therefore they know how to deliver the goods because that's what they grew up learning and that's how they stay in power. The more nonpartisan types tend to feel they survive by more nonpartisanship and as a consequence don't really get into the battle. Their battling is done behind the scenes and not out in the open and unfortunately or not most of the fluoridation fights have been out in the open.

In conclusion, Harris recommended the use of public opinion research in campaigning for the adoption of fluoridation.

I don't think you've used research properly. I don't mean your scientific research; you've not used public opinion research properly * * *. Every election is different. I think it's nonsensical to try to draw a conclusion that all fights for fluoridation are the same; each election must be approached as different. And once you take that assumption—that you draw on a cumulative drawing experience—you'll find you can beat the opposition.

DR. FLEMMING SUPPORTS FLUORIDATION

Mr. President, another distinguished participant in the conference is a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, now president of the University of Oregon, Dr. Arthur Flemming. As both national statesman and community leader, Dr. Flemming has been an articulate spokesman in the fight for fluoridation. He relates briefly the struggle fluoridation supporters face in his own hometown of Eugene, Oreg.

Community understanding and acceptance of fluoridation cannot be accomplished solely by support of national organizations and conventions. Dr. Flemming rightly points to "an increased investment of time, energy, and money, in an educational program at the grassroots." Characteristics of such a program should include a continuing and intensive program of education. Dr. Flemming warns that too often we discontinue our efforts after an election where opponents of fluoridation continue an intensive indoctrination campaign. Another suggestion, submits Dr. Flemming, is to extend the educational program to our schools. He recommends having the question of fluoridation of water supplies used as a national high school debate topic. Dr. Flemming stresses the importance of promoting open debate as being essential to the community's understanding and acceptance of fluoridation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Flemming's address be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Toward a Nation of Health Literates (By Arthur Flemming, Ph. D.)

Dr. Diefenbach, Dr. Rhyne, and friends: First of all, may I express my very deep appreciation to those who are responsible for developing this program for the opportunity of coming here and participating in what is certainly a very significant conference. I am delighted that I have had the privilege, as you have had, of listening to Mr. Rhyne's presentation. It seems to me that he has underlined points that need to be underlined. He is a very effective advocate in behalf of fluoridation. But as I think of him, and as I think of the contribution he is making to the life of our day, I also like to think of him as probably our Nation's, if not the world's most effective advocate of world peace through world law, and I am sure that many of you have noted the leadership that he has provided to this movement at a very critical time in our history.

As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I backed the Public Health Service program for fluoridation of the Nation's water supplies. I was convinced, on the basis of the evidence that was presented to me, that it would prevent disease. I was likewise convinced that it would not impair the health of anyone. As I left office, I said that I would try to respond affirmatively to opportunities that might be presented to me to give expression to these convictions. This is why I am very happy to be here with you today.

As a resident of Eugene, Oreg., I soon discovered that there were many persons at the grassroots who did not share my convictions. Just before I became a citizen of the community, the voters had refused to approve a

fluoridation program. In November 1964, 28,007 of the citizens of Eugene voted on a fluoridation proposal, and it was approved by a majority of 1,263. But, within a few weeks, the opponents succeeded in having the issue voted on again at a special election in September 1965, at which time a majority of 628 out of a total vote of 11,350 voted against fluoridation of our water supply. I might just parenthetically say that I was invited to participate in a panel discussion on this the evening before the first election, but I was out of the State and couldn't do it. I was then invited to participate in a panel discussion on the evening before the second election; I was in the city, and I did it. Now you can draw your own conclusions. I really think it suggests something-and that is, that there is some resentment on the part of the citizens at the grassroots at what they think are the efforts of some of us related to the national scene to impose something on them. And I think that this is a matter that has to be weighed carefully as we carry forward our campaign.

I agree with Mr. Rhyne that we have not raised the issue as often as we should as to whether or not it is appropriate to subject this issue to a referendum. However, I am afraid that in the State of Oregon, committed as it is to the concept of popular government, that we might have a little trouble with that issue even in the courts of Oregon. You know, in our State, if the legislature increases taxes in order to get additional revenue, the bill does not become law until 90 days after the Governor has signed it. There's no such thing as an emergency clause, and within that period of time, a comparatively small number of voters can make sure of the fact that this is voted on either at a special election or at the next regular election. And as one who is interested in the revenues of the State of Oregon, from the standpoint of the University of Oregon, I can assure you that from time to time we find this a little difficult.

But in any event, let's take a look at our situation from this standpoint of the poor results, nationwide, that we have had on referendum. What's wrong? To me the answer is clear. While those of us who believe in fluoridation have been obtaining the support of national organizations and have been talking to one another at conventions, our opponents have been doing a more effective job at the grassroots. And I believe that we must counter, with an increased investment of time, energy, and money, in an educational program at the grassroots.

What should be some of the characteristics of this program? First of all, I believe it should be a continuing program. If the issue is going to be on the ballot at a regular or special election, we do a pretty good job in carrying on an intensive program of edu-But after the election, whether we win or lose, we drop our educational program for oftentimes a long period of time. Our opponents, however, pick up just where they left off the day before the election. That's just what happened in Eugene. Our opponents were defeated in November 1964, and they were at work the day after election, beginning to circulate petitions designed to get it back on the ballot at a special election.

I believe that we must do likewise. We need to insert advertisements in our newspapers and buy time on radio and TV throughout the year—not just in connection with a regular or special election. We need to bring qualified witnesses to our communities to speak on the subject on a continuing basis. We need the cumulative impact of a 365-day-a-year educational program, and until we carry forward such a program, we are not going to improve our batting average as far as referendums are concerned.

Now the second thing I would like to say about this educational program is this: I believe that we must develop special educational programs for the schools of our communities. In 1950, the late Senator Taft was engaged in a vigorous and intensive campaign for reelection in the State of Ohio. I was participating with him to some degree in that campaign. And I noted that he was spending a good deal of time in the last few weeks of the campaign speaking at high school assemblies. One evening when I was with him, I asked him why he was using his time in this way. He replied, "I know that in many instances the high school students will go home and talk at the dinner table about some of the points I underlined in my talk. I know of no more effective way of reaching the voters."

I believe that he was right, and I believe that the point that he was underlining is one that we still need to keep in mind, and certainly those of us who are interested in fluoridation of water supplies should keep it in mind. But at the same time, we must keep in mind that we are asking the schools to become involved in a very controversial and emotional issue within our communities. If our side is to be presented, we must help the schools make sure that the other side is likewise presented. If both sides are fairly presented, I have no doubt about the way in which the discussion will be directed at the

family dinner table.

Why not try, for example, to have the question of fluoridation of water supplies used as the national high school debate topic sometime soon? Some of you will recall that the question of health care for the aged was used as the national high school debate topic in 1963. I believe that this played a major role in bringing many persons to the place where they demanded action in this area. You know, when a topic is selected, a very thorough, workmanlike job is done of bringing together a manual which presents material on both sides of the issue. I think that 1 year's debate on the merits of fluoridation of water in most of the high schools of the country would result in large numbers demanding action-not resisting action-on the part of our communities. And, of course, comparable efforts should be made to introduce the issue to students who are attending our colleges and universities. Likewise, I believe that our professional students in dental and medical schools should be introduced to a much greater degree than is the case at the present time to facets of health education, because they are key people in our communities and oftentimes it seems to me they have not been introduced as well as they might be to effective methods of health education.

Returning to our educational program within the community, I also believe that we must arrange for debates on the merits of fluoridated water between citizens of our communities. I do not believe that we can afford to ignore our opposition. I believe that we gain nothing—in fact, I think we lose—by attempting to ridicule the opposition. Some of their arguments have made an impact on large numbers of our citizens, and we must deal with them on their merits.

For example, some of our citizens who are active in the cause of civil liberties have decided to oppose the fluoridation of water supplies because they have accepted the argument that it is forced medication. I know that within our community you can't assume that the only people who are opposing fluoridation of water supplies are the extreme right, and that what might be termed the liberal element of the community are automatically for fluoridation of water supplies. I know of one leader in our community, who is highly respected, we lost at the last election because of her belief that there is a conflict between this and her concept of civil liberty. The kind of material

that Mr. Rhyne has presented to us this morning is the kind of material that we must present to the citizens of our communities—some of them thoughtful, effective leaders within our communities. And I believe that if we are willing to meet our opponents in open, well-run public debates, we can accomplish a number of objectives.

We can do a better job of introducing our citizens to the individuals and organizations that support fluoridated water. I feel that too often we try to overpower Mr. Average Citizen with our impressive endorsement, I would like to see us, for example, take more time to tell our citizens about the U.S. Public Health Service, the causes in which it has been involved, the dedicated services of its career personnel, and its 30 years of investigation of fluoridated water. TV program entitled "The Public Health Service Story," just as we need TV programs to tell the story of other agencies of the Government. Public Health Service is just a name to many of our citizens, instead of representing a group of dedicated workers who are giving the best years of their lives to improve the health of the people of this Nation.

I feel that we can, in open debate, do a more effective job of providing the main reasons for supporting fluoridated water. Our willingness to do it in open debate carries conviction. Our opponents will ignore most of our reasons, because they will not be able to refute them. And this will convey its own message to our listeners,

Also, I believe that in open debate we can do a more effective job of refuting the claims of our opponents. We can expose their case histories of alleged harm to the health of individuals who have lived in communities with fluoridated water. We can meet head on the claim that this is "forced medication" by using the kind of presentation that Mr. Rhyne has given to us. I know of no other controversial issue that has the kind of court record back of it that this one has. Just imagine, 30 times it has been tried out in the courts-30 times the courts have arrived at the same conclusion. can use that. We can use it more effectively than we have, particularly if we acquaint ourselves with some of the reasons why the courts did arrive at this conclusion.

Finally, as I think of our educational program, I believe that we must do a better job of tailoring our educational programs to the conditions that confront us in our respective communities. No two communities are alike when it comes to dealing with this issue. This means that we must invest money in research which will bring to light the behavioral patterns in our communities. It also means that we must be willing to set aside our prejudices as to the best way in which to deal with this problem and accept the results of research that is conducted in our communities designed to identify the best approaches that we can take in order to achieve the desired results.

Emma Carr Bivins, in her article, "People Are Giving Us the Answers," in the November issue of the Journal of the American Dental Association, said: "If today's town can win on fluoridation, it may possess the capacity to achieve almost any other advance or innovation it desires." I agree. I think it's one of the toughest problems that we have in our communities today, and if we can solve it, it's going to help us deal with many other issues within our communities in a more effective manner.

There isn't any question in my mind at all but that we must move forward in our efforts to attain fluoridation of the Nation's water supply. We must do so in the interest of the health of the citizens of our community; we must do so in order to demonstrate that under our form of government, truth can and will prevail.

May I express, as a citizen, my appreciation to each one of you for your willingness to give the time that you are giving in order to become better prepared to carry forward what is certainly a very important crusade as far as our Nation is concerned.

NACD SUPPORTS PROPOSED COM-MUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, an outstanding organization working to conserve our soil and water resources has endorsed the new approach to rural planning and development proposed in the President's community development message and introduced in the Senate by Senator Ellender.

The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, in a resolution at its annual convention February 6 through 10 in New Orleans, urged early and favorable consideration of this legal islation. It noted that the objectives of the proposal are consistent with the broad conservation and resource goals of our soil and water conservation districts throughout the country.

The district supervisors who are members of this organization are familiar with all the problems of local planning on a district basis and an endorsement from them is highly significant.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I would like to call this resolution to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 13

PROPOSED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
ACT OF 1966

President Johnson has recommended to Congress the enactment of legislation entitled "The Community Development District Act of 1966." This would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to designate, upon request, community development districts composed of towns and the surrounding rural area within normal commuting distance.

The purpose of these districts—to be governed by a board representing county and municipal governments concerned—would be to coordinate broad community planning efforts. They would be eligible for grants from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and other Federal assistance in order to:

(a) Provide for more equitable participation in community development activities by all segments of the community;

(b) Increase the efficiency of the use of natural resources on a regional basis;

 (c) Provide for full representation of local governmental units in community planning efforts;

(d) Improve the relationships between rural and urban areas; and

(e) Facilitate cooperation between all public and private organizations engaged and interested in community development.

These goals are in harmony with the broad conservation and resource development objectives of soil and water conservation districts.

Furthermore, the establishment of community development districts would provide a means by which local governments could secure comprehensive planning services and special assistance from the Federal Government that would enable them to focus on natural resource development, as well as other important community needs, and make better utilization of the skills, information, resources, and assistance of local soil and water conservation districts.

The NACD supports the passage of this legislation and urges early consideration, with districts and by the governmental agencies concerned, of the manner in which soil and water conservation districts can most usefully contribute to the achievement of the objective of this program.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE HATCH ACT TO THE COMMUNITY ACTION AND VISTA PROGRAMS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on February 9, I introduced an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act extending the Hatch Act's prohibitions on political activity to the employees of the community action and VISTA programs, who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal funds.

As I previously stated, this amendment was unanimously approved by the members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and was subsequently passed by the Senate during the first session. The conference committee unfortunately rejected the amendment. Any doubts that members of the conference committee had regarding my amendment last year should now be removed, for as the San Diego Evening Tribune commented:

The extra year of experience since Congress eliminated Murphy's amendment last year should provide ample grounds for keeping it intact at this time.

This experience clearly indicates that the problem will not vanish on its own and action is necessary if we do not want to see the program become frustrated by political maneuverings.

In my own State, the problem persists. In the February 7 edition of the Economic Opportunity Report, there is an article about the poverty program in Los Angeles. This report, Mr. President, is prepared by Capitol Publications, which is a private independent organization which hopes to become a source for information regarding the many programs and agencies involved in the economic opportunity program. I wish them success, for certainly it will not be an easy task to penetrate this maze. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an article from the Economic Opportunity Report be printed following my remarks.

Mr. President, I am most encouraged with the favorable reception that my amendment has received. Particularly encouraging is the favorable editorial comment. I share the sentiments of the Los Angeles Times that the program should not be "jeopardized by political finagling." The Times further states:

The Johnson administration has indicated a desire to divorce the program from politics. If that is, indeed, the case, it should have no opposition to barring those that operate the program from political activity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cogent editorials that appeared in the San Diego Evening Tribune and the Los Angeles Times be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Economic Opportunity Report, Feb. 7, 1966]

Los Angeles Votes To Cut Poverty Program

Los Angeles County supervisors have voted to oppose an increase of local funds for the poverty program scheduled to take place July 1, 1967. Growing conflict between the poor and the local government over representation of the poor in administration of the local community action agency (economic and youth opportunity agency) is seen as a major cause behind this decision.

Under existing provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, Los Angeles County is required to increase its share of financial backing for the economic and youth opportunity agency from a current 10-percent rate to 50 percent after July 1, 1967. County supervisors have opposed this increase, claiming they do not have sufficient funds available.

Behind the supervisors' decision is a long series of clashes dating back to the Watts riot, in what seems an unending struggle for control of the poverty program in Los Angeles. The various groups involved—political, racial, and ideological—accuse each other of trying to use control of the program to take political advantage of the poor. The final showdown may well come on March 1 when 1 million poor people in the county will go to the polls to elect 7 representatives from among their number to serve on the 23-member EYOA board.

Mayor Yorty, of Los Angeles, has supported the move by the county supervisors saying the city just doesn't have the funds to afford the increase of 50 percent. Representative Augustus Hawkins, Democrat, of California, whose district includes the Watts area, however, claims that Yortv and the county supervisors are grasping for control of the program without being willing to accept the responsibility that accompanies control. He added that the city should have funds available through savings gained as the program takes people off city relief rolls. If the city does not use these savings toward the program, he continued, then it is using poverty funds to subsidize local government. Should the county be unwilling to increase its commitment, Representative HAWKINS foresees a possible decrease to Federal funds going to the local community action project and an increase in other programs which are controlled directly by the Federal Government through the Office of Economic Opportunity.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Evening Tribune, Feb. 12, 1966]

POLITICS AND POVERTY PROGRAM

Senator George Murphy, Republican, of California, has taken a commendable step toward keeping politics out of the poverty program.

He has introduced an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which would place executives who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal poverty funds under the Hatch Act. This act is supposed to prevent politicking by Federal employees.

The Murphy amendment needs to stick this time. He introduced a similar proposal last year. It was accepted unanimously by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and passed the Senate without a dissenting vote. But this much-needed protection was cut out in conference.

The need for keeping politics out of the poverty program is plain to see. As Murphy said in a letter to his colleagues soliciting their support:

"The war on poverty is in danger of becoming bogged down by bickering and partisan political activities. This, of course, is most regrettable, and I am convinced that unless steps are taken to keep the program free from politics, the poor will benefit little, if any, from the program."

The extra year of experience since Congress eliminated Murphy's amendment last year should provide ample grounds for keeping it

intact this time.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 14, 1966] PROGRAM FOR POOR, NOT POLITICOS

Poverty program personnel would be barred from political activity under a proposal offered by Senator George Murphy.

The Senator would amend the Economic Opportunity Act to provide that community action agency employees who receive more than half their salary from Federal poverty funds, and employees of the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program would be placed under the Hatch Act.

Although the Senator's concern is primarily with the community action programs, VISTA personnel were included at the suggestion of other members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The amendment was approved unanimously by the committee last year and passed the Senate without dissenting vote. It died, however, in conference committees, ostensibly as the result of White House pressures.

In the meantime, dissatisfaction with functioning of the poverty program has increased and complaints over unwarranted politicking are growing

politicking are growing.

The Johnson administration has indicated a desire to divorce the program from politics. If that is, indeed, the case it should have no objection to barring those who operate the program from political activity.

The Job Corps, which operates under the Hatch Act, has largely avoided getting bogged down in politics. It would seem logical that restrictions imposed on that agency would serve an equally useful purpose in the poverty program.

The war on poverty is too important to be jeopardized by political finagling. As Senator Murphy emphasizes, the program should not be used to enhance the political fortunes of a few politicians or a political party.

Putting poverty workers under the Hatch

Putting poverty workers under the Hatch Act will not solve all the problems of the program, but it should have a beneficial effect.

Adoption of the Murphy amendment would serve notice on poverty program personnel that they are there to help the poor, not the politicians.

THE PROPOSED REDUCTION OF THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the past month many of us in this Chamber have spoken out against President Johnson's plans to cut back the school milk program for the next fiscal year. We have pointed out that to cut back such a worthwhile program by 80 percent simply to finance his war on poverty is to take from that which is worthy and tried and give to that which is untried and may not be worthy.

Recently we have received notification that the President also reduced the funds available for federally impacted schools. It is beginning to appear that the President is not leading a war on poverty as much as he is leading a war on children.

According to figures released by the Department of HEW, Office of Education, substantial reductions will be made in Public Law 874 funds. These funds are used for the operation and maintenance

of schools in districts impacted by Federal military and civilian activities. In South Dakota alone the reduction is over \$1 million.

If these proposed cuts go through, many of the school districts now operating would be forced to eliminate or cut back services that they are presently offering their students. Indeed, it is possible that some districts might have to close down completely.

Ellsworth Air Force Base in Rapid City, S. Dak., for example, is directly responsible for the size of Douglas Independent School District No. 3. Under the projected figures this school district would stand to lose \$223,963. It has been

estimated that the figure is four times the local ability to raise money to support their school program.

Mr. President, I fail to see any reasonable justification for this drastic cut in funds. All I can see is injustice tempered with politics. I see politics because these missing funds will ultimately end up financing some aspect of the poverty program in the vote-heavy urban areas. I see injustice because the President is penalizing the children and the families of those who have already made sacrifices. We must keep in mind that many of these children are not in impacted schools by choice. They are in impacted schools because their father

serves his country and is stationed at a military installation. Or, even worse, they have remained behind at the installation while their father has gone to defend our freedom in Vietman. I would hope that the Senate will not allow such an injustice to occur and will restore the Public Law 874 funds to the present authorized level.

I ask unanimous consent that the proposed Budget Bureau cuts as compared to the Office of Education requests for fiscal year 1967 in South Dakota be listed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

South Dakota

- Top at the new and strain to the strain to	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitle- ments under Public Law 874	Estimated entitle- ments under proposed amend- ments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget	Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitle- ments under Public Law 874	Estimated entitle-ments under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget
Flandreau Independent School District No. 3, Moody- Pierre Independent School District No. 1, Hughes	1 1	\$30, 612 85, 788	\$10,779 24,636	Hill City Independent School District No. 10, Pennington	2	\$11,732	\$6,159
Ravinia and Plain Center Independent School Dis- trict No. 98, Charles Mix.	1	9, 349	4,773	Cleghorn Common School District No. 85, Penning-	2	2, 566	462
Lake Andes Independent School District, Charles Mix	1	10, 632	5, 851	Shannon County Independent School District No. 1, Shannon	11351	242, 146	III III III
Pickstown Independent School District No. 96,	1542	a new Comp	ationin A Swam	Washabaugh Unorganized CSD, Washabaugh Eagle Butte Independent School District No. 3.	2 2	15, 948	189, 853 10, 162
Charles Mix Chamberlain Independent School District, Brule Buckeye Consolidated No. 13, Hughes	1 1 1	74, 422 38, 495 0	60, 666 20, 634 0	Dewey. Interior Independent School District No. 55, Jackson.	2 2	83, 587 11, 182	62, 206 8, 161
Sisseton Independent School District No. 1, Roberts Wagner Independent School District No. 99, Charles	1	19, 981	6, 467	Bennett County Independent High School District, Bennett	2	10, 265	6, 159
Mix. Blunt Independent School District No. 2, Hughes.	1	7, 699 2, 200	2, 002 154	White River Independent School District No. 29, Mellette	2	42,894	30, 643
Harrold Independent School District No. 3, Hughes Gettysburg Independent School District No. 1,	1	0	0	Martin Common School District No. 2, Bennett Timber Lake Independent School District No. 2.	10 2	30, 979	19, 24
Potter Mobridge Independent School District No. 13, Wal-	1	24, 197	9, 085	Dewey	2 2	7,882 4,583	2, 150
worth.	1	10,082	10 770	McLaughlin Independent School District No. 3, Corson			3, 234
Wahehe Common School District No. 83, Charles Mix- Elvira Township Independent School District No. 4,	1	13, 198	10,778	McIntosh Independent School District No. 1, Corson.	2 2	61, 408 57, 742	42, 190 39, 419
Buffalo Victory Common School District No. 8, Buffalo	1	10,632	7,083	Smee Independent School District No. 4, Corson	2 2	64, 340 17, 231	49, 118 13, 24
Pukwana Independent School District No. 1, Brule_Browns Valley Independent School District No. 103, Roberts.	1	8,615	4,927	Blackpipe Common School District No. 8, Mellette North River School District No. 16, Ziebach Provo Independent School District No. 36, Fall	2 2	23, 280 4, 583	17, 86 2, 61
Highmore Independent School District No. 1, Hyde- Wessington Springs Independent School District No.	1	11, 915	6, 467	RiverWashington Common School District No. 26, Mellette	2 2	182, 633 3, 849	142, 204 2, 772
18, Jerauld. Platte Independent School District No. 97, Charles	abr	// Lagaba	Tart namen	Edgemont Independent School District No. 37, Fall River	2	26, 580	16, 629
Mix	1	2, 383	0	Wall Independent School District No. 58, Pennington Keystone Common School District No. 2, Penning-	2	3, 300	d (line) w (
Congressional district total		360, 200	174, 302	Common School District No. 3, Bennett	2 2	4, 399 17, 414	2, 464 13, 242
Hot Springs Independent School District No. 10, Fall River	2	89, 822	60, 361	Duncon Common School District, Corson	2	4, 949	3, 850
Piedmont School District No. 34, Meade	2	2, 200	154	Lawrence	2	12, 465	olmou)
Rapid City Independent School District No. 1, Pennington	2	271, 299	109, 480	Oral School District, No. 34, Fall River New Ideal School District No. 112, Tripp	2 2	3, 483 5, 499	1, 693
Sturgis Independent School District No. 12, Meade Fort Pierre Independent School District No. 1, Stan-	2	101, 736	51, 430	Reliance Public School District No. 9, Lyman Hot Springs Common School District No. 1, Fall	2	6, 966	3, 388
leyCold Brook School District No. 27, Custer	2 2 2	11, 549 4, 216	5, 236 3, 079	River. Deadwood Independent School District No. 102,	2	2,750	1,848
Todd County Independent School District, Todd	2	282, 291	212, 950	Lawrence	2	6, 599	TOTAL CO.
Douglas Independent School District No. 3, Pennington.	2	1,002,313	778, 350	Congressional district total		2, 776, 605	1, 929, 417
Newell Independent School District No. 37, Butte Custer Independent School District, Custer	2 2 2	10, 815 18, 514	3, 388 6, 159	Total, South Dakota			2, 103, 719
Rapid Valley School District No. 4, Pennington	2	8, 616	3, 541	Programme Statement of Section 1997	in the	3,299,500	2, 200, 120

JOHN F. KENNEDY ON EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the publication today of a most useful book serves to remind us of the great strides which have been made in education during the past few years.

The book is entitled "John F. Kennedy on Education" and is a definitive compilation of the late President's speeches and writings on that and related subjects from his days as a young Massachusetts Congressman to his untimely death.

Mr. O'Hara, assistant dean of the University of Connecticut School of Law, has

rendered considerable service in bringing together President Kennedy's many writings. He has also ably traced the educational influences on his early life and the varied actions which Congressman, Senator, and finally President Kennedy took on behalf of education.

Our distinguished colleague in the House of Representatives, Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, has written a preface to this excellent book. Since the preface, written by a Representative with a compelling interest in improving American education, is a valuable summary of "John F. Kennedy on

Education," Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preface to which I have alluded be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the preface to the book was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREFACE BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS, OF INDIANA

"Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress," President John F. Kennedy told Congress as he began his special message on education of January 29, 1963. Kennedy went on to present the most sweeping program for Federal help to education ever advocated by an American Presi-

Yet, as Arthur Schlesinger has recently reminded us, "Little disappointed the Kennedys more in domestic policy than their failure to make significant progress in Federal aid to education." "A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House," Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1965, page 662.

Schlesinger's judgment, while accurate, must be tempered. For less than 3 years after Kennedy's 1963 message, nearly every education measure which he had then pressed Congress to enact had become law.

President Johnson's leadership, substantial margins in Congress committed to education and wideswept public support-all these factors helped produce the extraordinary record of education legislation of 1963–65: the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Acts of 1963 and 1965, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, and major amendments to the Vocational Education and National Defense Education Acts, to cite only a few of the principal measures.

William O'Hara's book, "John F. Kennedy on Education," is a valuable documentation of the contribution of President Kennedy's leadership to the remarkable educational achievements of the 88th and 89th Con-

For despite the tragedy of the assassination and despite the hurdles which frustrated the passage of education bills during the 3 years of his Presidency, Kennedy, by his vigorous advocacy of increased Federal support of education, helped make possible the later achievements.

By providing excerpts from Kennedy's public statements on education during his years as a Representative and Senator as well as during the 1960 campaign and the Presidential period, Mr. O'Hara has illumined a significant aspect of Kennedy's entire political These speeches and articles reveal career. Kennedy's continuing interest in education, in the broadest sense of the word. They reflect his profound concern with the quality of American life, his respect for intelligence and ideas, his rapport with the academic community, and his preoccupation with the problems of young people.

Again and again Kennedy speaks of improving the dialog between the politician and the scholar, of the responsibility of the young to prepare for leadership in a democracy, of the value of education not only as a national resource in the cold war but as essential in enhancing the quality of the

life of the individual.

Mr. O'Hara, now assistant dean of the University of Connecticut Law School, was, as counsel to the special subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee from April 1962 to November 1963, a direct participant in work on most of the education bills Congress considered during President Kennedy's administration and is therefore well qualified to undertake this highly useful compilation.

Kennedy's interest in education as a public issue grew and matured over the yearsfrom the Congressman's proposal to improve selection procedures for service academy appointments to the Senator's opposition to the loyalty oath requirement in the National Defense Education Act to the President's plea to Congress for Federal aid to education over a broad spectrum. As a member of the two congressional committees with primary jurisdiction over education bills, the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Kennedy was exceptionally well schooled in the politics of education by the time he came to the Presidency. As a legislator, he saw firsthand the major obstacles confronting advocates of education bills: the issues of civil rights, aid to church-related schools, and Federal control.

All these issues are, in one way or another, still with us but all have, in at least one respect, been overcome: Congress is passing major education bills and the role of the Federal Government in support of American education has grown substantially in the last few years. Indeed, during my four terms in Congress, especially as a member of Congressman Kennedy's old committee, Education and Labor (and presently holder of his old seat as second ranking member of the subcommittee which handles elementary and secondary school bills), I have myself witnessed this significant change.

Congress and the American people have been taking seriously President Kennedy's observation in his first message to Congress on education, on February 20, 1961. human mind is our fundamental resource." President Johnson has long shared this conviction and the Nation is now investing more in this most valuable of all our resources. Mr. O'Hara's book traces the Kennedy commitment to that investment.

The book moves from the congressional years to the 1960 campaign, and the Presidential years and concludes with a section on that most successful of all John F. Kennedy's appeals to American youth, the Peace Corps.

The appendices will be useful to students of Kennedy's domestic policies. They list education bills he introduced while in Congress and those enacted into law during his administration.

A NEW PLANT FOR THE GOVERN-MENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, there has been some discussion recently on the Government Printing Office's announcement of plans to construct a new plant away from downtown Washington.

As I am in favor of this decision, I should like to call attention to an article printed in the ITU Review on January This article points out in very clear and reasonable terms the fact that the new plant will serve the interests of efficiency and long-term saving. A study made by the International Typographical Union has revealed that a saving of \$4.5 million can be made annually by concentrating GPO activities in one building located where more elbow room would be available.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the ITU Review of January 27, 1966, entitled "Logic Supports New Building for Government Printing Office" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOGIC SUPPORTS NEW BUILDING FOR GOVERN-MENT PRINTING OFFICE

A heated controversy is presently raging in Washington, D.C., regarding the Government Printing Office. The Public Printer has logically outlined plans for abandoning the GPO's obsolete four-building complex and constructing a new plant away from the downtown congestion.

Opposed to construction of the new building is the master printers (nonunion) section of Printing Industry of America and, undoubtedly, many agencies of the Government which are doing some of their own printing and proofreading. The jobs of many of the 1,800 ITU members employed at the GPO are at stake.

A statement on the proposed GPO relocation included the following facts which it seems will be of benefit to all ITU members. The U.S. Government bureaus, like bureaucrats everywhere, it must be remembered, exert a constant pressure for expansion from within. Each agency would like to do its own printing. They would use clerks, stenographers, and a miscellaneous potpourri of unskilled and semiskilled help to produce work of a questionable quality.

Government Printing Office operations are now conducted in a crowded, multistory, four-building complex in a congested-traffic area and in a location wholly incompatible with an industrial operation of this size. Insufficient floor space, restricted floor-loading capacities, limited ceiling heights, and narrow columnar spacing prohibit efficient placement of key production equipment, restrict the free flow of work in progress, and prevent raw-stock storage and interim storage at, or near, production points.

TENUOUS MATERIALS HANDLING

Because of insufficient warehouse space at this site, about half of the GPO's daily stock intake of from 16 to 18 freightcar loads of paper are received and rehandled from a warehouse located 15 miles from the GPO, and also from two other locations in the metropolitan area of the city. These factors impose an almost insolvable logistic problem, faced every working day, but the worst is yet to come.

The major portion of paper received at the main plant must be lowered five levels and power-trucked through a tunnel under North Capitol Street connecting the receiving warehouse with production areas in Building No. 3. Here it must be elevator-lifted as many as six levels before being placed at points of

use in this building.

A careful study was conducted to analyze the possibility of acquiring additional space at the present location of the GPO. study revealed that while more room was available, raw materials would still have to be handled from the receiving point in the warehouse building across North Capitol Street and trucked under the street and thence to points of use at the space added at this location.

NEED 27 FREIGHT ELEVATORS NOW

Complete dependence upon 27 freight elevators for movement of paper and partially completed work significantly retards efforts to streamline production operations. hazards and greater than normal spoilage of both materials and products are created by multiple movements of paper and crowding skid storage into work areas. It was determined, after analyzing the results of this study, that the only permanent and practica-ble answer to the GPO's perplexing space and logistics problems would be relocation to an efficiently designed and engineered two-story

Therefore, in 1963, the Public Printer submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing plans for such relocation, and asked that the \$6,450,000 which the Congress had authorized for an annex to the present fourbuilding complex be returned to the Treasury.

With the new building, as proposed by the Public Printer, all materials handling would be confined to the ground level. Transportation of stock, therefore, would be only on a horizontal plane from receipt of paper through succeeding printing and binding operations and, finally, to shipping and delivery. This is the key factor to the substantial savings expected of this plan.

RECOMMENDED BY PUBLIC PRINTER

Lighter supporting operations, including administrative offices, could then be arranged over this area on the second level. Because of the economies which could be realized by operating in a two-story building, the Public Printer felt it was incumbent upon him to recommend this course of

The cost of new facilities for the GPO, including the two-story building, is estimated at about \$47 million. An annual saving of \$3 million is anticipated in comparing present operating costs with the costs of production in the two-story building. An additional fringe benefit, that of vacating much needed downtown office space for more appropriate use, is estimated to be worth an additional \$1.5 million. This makes a total of \$4.5 million that can be saved annually by moving the GPO to an area where elbow room would be available.

Cost of the project would be recovered from the savings in about 10 years. And after the cost was recovered, the savings would continue to be returned for many years to come. The project, incidentally, has been authorized by both the House and Senate Public Works Committees.

The GPO expects to continue its long-established policy of buying specialty printing, and book and job printing which lends itself to procurement from commercial sources, consistent with law and the prudent expenditure of public funds. In the last fiscal year, more than 40 percent of the total volume of printing and binding ordered from the GPO was obtained from the commercial printing industry.

Whether the GPO moves to a new building or stays in the present complex there will be no change in the GPO's procurement of commercial printing. The question is simply whether to continue to operate in the present inadequate and obsolete plant, with its concomitant needless loss of \$4.5 million per year, or construct a modernly designed and engineered building and effect that sav-

ing.

HAS AGRICULTURE COME TO A TURN IN THE ROAD?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, during the past week, it was my privilege to share the speaking platform at the 1966 annual convention of the National Livestock Feeders Association in Omaha with Mr. Carroll P. Streeter, editor of the Farm Journal.

As most Members of the Senate know, the Farm Journal is one of America's outstanding agricultural publications. Its large circulation and the high respect for its accuracy and objectivity make its editorial voice one of the most authoritative in its field.

Mr. Streeter's thoughtful address, "Have We Come to a Turn in the Road?" left a deep impression on those at the convention, including this Senator.

Based on his 39 years of experience as a reporter and editor of this highly respected publication, Mr. Streeter was able to present an accurate and revealing description of agriculture in our country today and its prospects for the future.

He laid particular stress on the fact that farm surpluses, a problem which has been plaguing American agriculture for decades, have largely disappeared. In fact, just the reverse is happening, shortages are beginning to appear. Mr. Streeter then made a thorough analysis of the conditions which have resulted in

this dramatic turn of events.

In detailing world agricultural production trends and contrasting them with world population trends and projected needs for food, Mr. Streeter brought home a point which presents our country and the Congress with a most serious and challenging situation. He said:

The people who control farming in the United States are going to do much to shape the destiny of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Streeter's remarks entitled, "Have We Come to a Turn in the Road?" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the REC-

ORD, as follows:

HAVE WE COME TO A TURN IN THE ROAD? (By Carroll P. Streeter)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—An address by Carroll P. Streeter, editor of Farm Journal, Philadelphia, Pa., at the 1966 annual convention of the National Livestock Feeders Association, Omaha, Nebr., February 16, 1966.)

The title of my talk, "Have We Come to a Turn in the Road?" is phrased as a question. But actually there is no doubt about it. We have come to a turn, all right, and it's a momentous one.

On the one hand, farming in this country is coming over the top of the hill, and prospects have never looked so bright. At the same time millions of people in half the world face the very real threat, not too far off, not just of continued hunger but of actual starvation.

I want to discuss both the bright and the dark sides of the picture and then suggest some things I believe we need do if we are to keep either our own prosperity or help others.

On the domestic farm scene when have we ever done better? In a business as big as agriculture, extending to every nook and corner of the United States and involving some 250 commercial products or more, things are never good all over at the same time. But neither are they bad all over at once. In the 39 years I've been roaming over this country as a farm magazine man I've never seen so many farmers and ranchmen doing so well at any one moment as this morning in February of 1966.

Farm income is at record heights.

The surpluses of food we've worried so much about in recent years have largely disappeared; some have vanished completely. We're short right now of dried milk, rice and anything containing protein (except soybeans where we might have a small carryover). Feed grains, of which we had an 85 million ton excess in 1961 have been fed down to 55 to 60 million tons by now—not far above what we should prudently carry as a reserve. Something dramatic has happened to

wheat, which for years has been the big villain in the food surplus picture.

About a year ago Farm Journal carried an article by Karl Hobson, of Washington State University, a leading authority on the wheat situation, reporting that the world wheat surplus was disappearing. It was news that surprised most of us.

In a recent dispatch to us Hobson now warns that the day of a severe shortage is drawing closer. In fact, he says, "the world right now is eating on borrowed time." 6 years now the world has been consuming wheat faster than it raised it. The carryover in the four major exporting countries-United States, Canada, Australia and Argentina-will be 1.2 billion bushels, nearly all of this in the United States and Canada.

"In the view of many," says Hobson, "this is about as low as we dare let the carryover

get in today's world.

"As for the United States," he continues, "our carryover next July 1 (providing shipping restrictions are removed) is likely to be about 650 million bushels. This is about what we need for a strategic reserve, amount below which we should never allow our stocks to fall."

So that's what's happening to our surpluses.

Meanwhile our exports, both for dollars and for free, are at record heights and before long should hit \$7 billion a year. Right now we export the produce from one acre in every four of our cultivated land. In fact, it may well be that the best possibilities for growth in American agriculture from here on will lie abroad, not in the United States-a fact that more farmers need to wake up to.

In recent decades there has been a heavy exodus of people out of farming, and it is well known that by now farmers constitute only 7 percent of the population. To hear some people tell it you'd think this had been a calamity. Actually it has been for some, but for those who are left it has been a boon. It has simply meant fewer people cutting up an ever larger pie and getting larger slices.

Meanwhile the pie itself gets bigger every year. It has to, of course, when we have some 8,000 more people in this country sitting down to the breakfast table every morning to say nothing of huge numbers abroad.

You know how bright the prospects look in the livestock business. Supplies are not only moderate but appear likely to stay that way, particularly in the beef world. the present and the immediate future there's no threat of consequence from imports. Demand is at record levels not only here but in Western Europe and England. The livestock economy as a whole is robust, with nothing but good times immediately ahead.

The fact is, then, that farming in this country is coming into a new day. Not only is it a growth industry, but it is moving into stronger hands every day. There will be ups and downs, as there always have been, but if we can avoid a depression, a calamitous drought, serious inflation, or a major war the future is brighter than it ever has been for farmers who have the intelligence and the capital to stay in the game.

Contrast that with what's happening in the hungry half of the world. While we sit here in the glow of good times there's a crisis of truly alarming proportions looming in most of Asia, Africa, and the northern part of Latin America, where over half the world's people live. And it's going to affect each one of us, even though we live here

and have plenty to eat.

These people aren't going to starve quietly. The desperate chaos that would result would make Vietnam look like a neighborhood argument. Some of you have boys in Vietnam this morning. You don't have to be told that what happens half way around the world affects you. You not only send boys to fight in a far-off jungle; you send a of tax money to support both a war and a food-aid program. And if the Communists, who thrive on this kind of misery, can take over huge chunks of the world, a piece at a time, someday our own security right here is threatened.

What's happened to pose this threat of mass starvation? We haven't been hearing about it, until lately anyway, and even now

most of us haven't waked up to it.

In the 1950's we seemed to be making some gain in the race to feed the world's people. We know now that the gain was tempo-DDT had killed malaria mosquitos and thus opened up farming in large regions. Big irrigation projects had brought other land into production. The benefits of both were realized some years ago.

About the year 1958 the tide began to turn. By 1960 we were definitely losing in per capita food production in the world, and the gap is steadily widening. The farther into the sixties we get the more fright-

ening the picture becomes.

Opening up new land has always been the chief means of getting more food in needy But now the hungry half of the world is running out of new land to farm. That's the first big happening. The second is that since World War II the boom in population-in the same part of the world that's out of land—has been fantastic. Much lower death rates plus higher birth rates account

This statement from Lester Brown, staff economist in the USDA and an expert in these matters, makes the picture clear;

"From the beginning of the human race until 1960," says Dr. Brown, "world population built up a little more than 3 billion people. Barring something drastic, by the year 2,000-34 years from now-we'll have another 3 billion. We will double what it took millennia to produce. In just 34 years, then, we will need to double world food output, even to continue at today's inadequate dietary levels."

We might do it if the land were where the people will be, but it isn't. Asia, for example, has 56 percent of the world's people, only 31 percent of its arable land. productive part of the world is in the North and South temperate zones, but both the density of population and the lowest-yielding agriculture happen to be in the tropics.

The tropical parts of the world have increased yields per acre only 7 percent, as compared with 107 percent in North America. In the 1930s six big regions had grain to export. Today only two have any to spare-North America and Australia-New Zealand

It's a sobering thought, and one that hasn't occurred to most of us, that the United States has about the only surplus of good land anywhere in the world. The 57 million acres that we have on the shelf, either through a Soil Bank or annual crop-control programs, constitutes the world's only safety valve.

The people who control farming in the United States are going to do much to shape the destiny of the world. Had you realized that this is you?

We're hearing a great deal these days will hear more—about taking this idle land back into production to feed the world's hungry. Many people are saying that it's ridiculous, even criminal, to let this good farm land sit here doing nothing when the world is so short of food.

Senator McGovern of South Dakota and Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, are among the leaders in Congress who are talking about this.

It's an appealing idea of course: put this land back into production thus increasing our own business; get rid of the Government controls nobody likes; possibly spend no more money than present farm programs cost us; and feed the hungry. There's something here to appeal to just about everybody.

The trouble is the answer isn't that simple-it would be nice if it were.

For one thing, the hungry countries can't presently take in and distribute much more food than we are sending now. No country that can use more food is going without it. Before these nations can use more they'll have to develop ports, transportation facili-ties, and a distributive setup.

Indiscriminate dumping of huge quanti-ties of our surplus foods could well do more long-range harm than good. It could smother markets over there just when farmers of these countries are struggling to get on their feet. Furthermore it could encourage some of these nations to go right on depending on us for food while continuing to turn their own scant resources to military buildups and attempts at industrialization. That's been one of the problems thus far.

What then is to be done?

Well first, we'll have to continue to send food from here-better food, enriched with vitamins and minerals, and probably even more of it than now. It should be the food people need-not just what we want to get rid of. It should be food especially for children, for nutritionists say that a child seriously malnourished up to age 6 is maimed for life, mentally as well as physically.

Second we'll need to do a lot more than we're doing already to step-up food produc-

tion over there, where the hungry people are. That's the only real answer, for we certainly can't feed the world from here. If there's not much more new land that can be brought in, the only answer is to increase production per acre on the land there is. It will be a long, slow process, for it involves more than seed fertilizer, machinery and technical know-how. Those things can be supplied fairly easily. It depends first on such things as achieving stable government; a private enterprise system; a market economy in which a farmer can sell something, not just raise enough for his own subsistence; education; health; credit; roads and waterways. It means changing attitudes, traditions, and taboos built up over the cen-

Because the process will be slow and because the need is so imminent, there's not a moment to be lost. Within 10 or 15 years we may need all of our own idle land back in production—those 57 million acres mentioned a moment ago that are the world's only land in reserve. By that time we've got to have agriculture in the hungry world on its own feet if a very large number of our fellow human beings are to escape starvation. That's the span of time we have to work with. It isn't much and it may not be enough.

This is one reason why we're going to have to be a lot tougher in dispensing foreign aid than we have been. Too often we have said in effect, "Here it is, take it and do what you want with it." From now on we are going to have to require, in return for our help, that the hungry countries turn their first energies to building up their own agriculture. You wouldn't think they would have to be forced to do it, but apparently that's the case. I'm glad to say that at long last, we have begun to toughen our give-away programs. It certainly seems high time.

There's a third big thing to be done and that's slow down population growth. as important as stepping up food production. I am happy that here there is something encouraging to report.

Maybe you saw an article in the February Farm Journal entitled "A Loop That Can Shake the World." If you didn't, let me take just a minute to tell you about it.

The Lippes Loop, as it's called, is a ridiculously simple, inexpensive contraceptive that even the poorest and most illiterate and most undisciplined people in the world can use. It is named after a young American doctor, Dr. Jack Lippes, of the University of Buffalo.

Actually it is nothing but a little zig-zag piece of plastic, an inch and a half long that looks about like a piece of doorbell wire. A doctor inserts it in a woman's uterus and as long as it's there she will not conceive. If she want children later she simply has the doctor take the loop out and she can have them. About 15 percent of women can't retain the loop or must have it removed but for the remainder it is 98 percent effective. It requires no attention, causes no discomfort, and there's no danger to health. It can be put in and forgot about. And it costs only a dime. Contraceptive pills, on the other hand, cost about \$24 a year, and have to be taken regularly.

We said in Farm Journal that perhaps this little loop will have more impact on the world than the atom bomb-and it just might.

Indian Government officials think that it could bring India's population problem under control in 10 years. There's a factory there now turning out 14,000 a day.

In Korea, Formosa, Chile, Jamaica, Nepal, and many other overpopulated parts of the world hundreds of thousands of these loops are in use today, and millions will be to-morrow. They're even being used to limit the number of sacred cows which are such a scourge in India.

So far in this talk we have talked about our own booming farm economy and the dire food picture in the hungry world. But what do we need do at this juncture to keep America strong? Unless this country stays sound and vigorous we can neither protect what we have nor effectively be our brother's keeper elsewhere.

There are three distinct threats that I believe you as livestock men, and everybody else in rural America, need be concerned about. Certainly they should interest you as citizens, but also as livestock feeders, for sooner or later they will affect your business.

The first is the reapportionment fight now going on in Congress.

Until recently you had the right to decide how to choose your own legislatures—a privilege Americans have enjoyed since founding of the Constitution. But on June 15, 1964, the Supreme Court of the United States took away your right to choose. It said that henceforth both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned on the basis of population. No longer would geography count for anything in selecting the State senate.

Now it may be that the people of some States will want it that way. But it may also be that the citizens of some States won't. The point is they won't get to decide. Court down in Washington has decided it for them.

Senator Dirksen, of Illinois, now has a constitutional amendment before the Senate to let the people decide in a popular referendum how they want their own legis-latures constituted. "In a country such as America," he asks, "is there something wrong with letting the people decide?" Well, is there?

If you are interested in protecting one of your most basic rights, write to your Senators and Congressmen and tell them you want them to vote for the Dirksen amendment.

And do it right now.

A second threat I would mention is inflation which, if we get enough of it, could wreck our economy and the livestock busi-ness right along with it. The cause of in-flation is simple: It's too much money and credit chasing too few goods. Too much money is caused largely by Government deficit spending. Too much credit is due to making borrowed money too cheap. The Government can cure the first by cutting down its spending on things that we can either forgo or at least postpone. The Federal Reserve System can control the second with tighter fiscal policies.

The economy is near the bursting point right now. Unemployment is at an alltime low. Many industries are running at capacity. Besides which we happen to have an expensive war on our hands, and it's getting more expensive every day. We hear about the war on poverty, but isn't one war at a time enough?

Wouldn't it be only sensible under such conditions to let most of the Great Society projects wait? If you think so, that's another thing you can tell your Senators and Congressmen. You can take care of that and reapportionment for the price of one postage

The third threat creeps up on us gradually, yet as inexorably as an incoming tide. It is the steady trend toward a paternalistic government—or, as somebody called it, the all-mothering state—which would take over our problems and us right along with it.

An amazingly perceptive French philos-opher named deTocqueville saw the danger when he came over here to study democracy in America a good many years ago. When citizens become wards of the state, he warned (and I quote) "the will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided. Such a power," he said, "does not destroy but it enervates, extinguishes and stupifies a people till the nation is reduced to nothing but a flock of timid and industrious animals of which the government is

the shepherd."

If you think he was exaggerating look around and see what is happening today. You won't need to look further than agriculture, where more and more farmers continue to get more and more of their income from Government. With one hand the Secretary of Agriculture beats down market prices for grain by dumping Government stocks while offering farmers bigger Government handouts in the form of direct payments with the other. A little at a time he gets a little stronger grip on American agriculture. He is more firmly in control of more farmers this year than he was last year. Even livestock feeders are affected. The Secretary has a lot to do with what they pay for feed.

Most all of us agree that everybody in this country should have a fair chance at health, education, and a job. We've accepted social security for the aged as a good thing. We know there are some social programs such as education, public health, and care of the poor that the individual cannot provide for himself that Government has to. Most of us believe in Government supports in agriculture to stabilize grain markets from temporary gluts and to stabilize markets tem-

porarily.

But beyond that what? Do you want to go on down the path—which we are undeniably on now—toward the welfare state and socialism? Or do you want, enough to fight for it, a country in which the individual citizen stands on his own two feet, makes his own decisions, controls his own business and keeps government servant not master? Which turn of the road do you prefer for you and your children from this point on?

That, gentlemen, just may be the most

important question of all.

TROUBLE AHEAD IN LATIN AMERICA?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a respected Catholic journalist, who has written about Latin America for many years, interviewed scores of Latin American bishops, advisers to bishops, and newsmen at the recently concluded Vatican Council and during an earlier tour of Latin America. He reports a very widespread anti-American feeling with the right, center, and left of the Latin political spectrum.

What accounts for such a widespread alienation? The writer, Mr. Gary Mac-

Eoin, sums it up as follows:

What [Latins] do not understand is how Washington can confine its concern to the military elements of the equation "The dictatorship holds back the explosion, but if the social and population pressures continue to mount, as they are mounting, the day of the catastrophic release has to come," one bishop told me.

You provide a breathing space in which to work frantically for social progress, and then you fritter it away in business as usual.

It may be, Mr. President, that the observers whom Mr. MacEoin quotes have our policy somewhat out of focus, but if politics is the art of the possible at home, it is also the art of the realistic abroad, and part of this realism should

be to see ourselves as others see us.

The salient fact is that our Latin friends are concerned, and they have reason to be. As Mr. MacEoin says, "They find the U.S. public bored with Latin America while concerned about less urgent problems of their own country and the other continents."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Have We a Latin American Policy?" which appeared in the February 11 issue of the newspaper of the Catholic Diocese of Boise, the Idaho Register, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE WE A LATIN AMERICAN POLICY?

(By Gary MacEoin)

"Virtually everywhere, from the top to the bottom and from the right to the left * * * a general distrust and suspicion of the Johnson administration and a very wide anti-American feeling."

That is what Columnist Walter Lippmann found on a recent trip to South America. Our relations with the Latin Americans continue to deteriorate, he sums up. There is "an urgent, almost desperate, need for change at the highest levels in Washington."

In Rome, during the last session of the council, I talked to scores of Latin American bishops, advisers to bishops, and newsmen. Almost without exception, the views they expressed to me confirm the conclusion which Lippmann has now reached. They find Washington talking rapid social progress while ready to use force to block social change.

They find the U.S. public bored with Latin America while concerned about less urgent problems of their own country and the other continents. Earlier in 1965, I had made a 2-month tour of nine Latin American countries, and what I then saw and heard fell into the same pattern.

The intensified anti-U.S. sentiment does not flow merely from our sponsorship and support of military dictatorships. Many are willing to concede that tough controls are needed to end inflation and corruption, and to accumulate capital by curbing the anti-social spending of the wealthy.

What they do not understand is how Washington can confine its concern to the military elements of the equation. "The dictatorship holds back the explosion, but if the social and population pressures continue to mount, as they are mounting, the day of the catastrophic release has come," one bishop said to me

"You provide a breathing space in which to work frantically for social progress, and then you fritter it away in business as usual."

As for the Alliance for Progress, few take it seriously these days. "Try to look honestly at the economic facts," another bishop said to me. "The aid you offer bears no realistic relationship to the needs nor, indeed, to your ability to help. The strings attached have become chains.

"Only U.S. big business benefits. Each year the gap between our living standards and yours grows wider. Each year, you withdraw more capital in interest, dividends, repatriation of principal and inflated prices for the goods we must import than we get for our exports plus Alliance aid.

"Our capital needs for development grow. Our available capital diminishes. This is something we long suspected, but now it is fully documented by United Nations studies."

The mood of these and other speakers was one of sorrow more than anger. "We are going to transform Latin America," one said to me.

"We have no choice. If you lack the enlightened self-interest to help us, we'll do it in spite of you and—if necessary—against you."

The confidence that Latin America can transform itself by its own efforts is something new. Several bishops expressed it to me, usually in the context of what the Council said in Schema 13 on man's new realization of his powers, of what the Brazilians

call conscientizacao, the development of group awareness.

"Passivity is a thing of the past," an archbishop told me. "Even at the lowest levels, people are rapidly growing aware of what is happening in the world and what can happen in their own backyard."

"If the people in the United States ever find that out," I suggested, "they will be mightily relieved to know they don't have to underwrite the transformation."

"That is for them to decide," he answered. "They have at least two case histories in this century of rapid development without external help. A preliminary step is to seize all fixed assets and to suspend practically all trading with the outside. Your businessmen won't like that.

"Next comes the stage of zenophobia, then that of aggressiveness, then the need for nuclear bombs along with the ability to manufacture them. No, I don't think there is much reason to be relieved at the prospect."

RETREAT ON REDWOODS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times carries an editorial, "Retreat on Redwoods," concerning S. 2962, the administration's bill to create a Redwood National Park, introduced Wednesday by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchell. I wish to comment on the editorial and on the issue but first I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETREAT ON REDWOODS

In his message on conservation yesterday, President Johnson put forward an excellent program to combat water pollution, on which we will comment later, and he reaffirmed his support for several desirable bills now pending for national parks and seashores.

But on one of the most controversial of current issues in this field—the size of the proposed Redwood National Park in northern California—his stand is a sharp disappointment.

For some months the administration has been wavering between two plans. One, embodied in a bill by Representative Cohelan, of California, would establish a 90,000-acre park. More than a score of House Members have introduced similar bills. The alternative plan drafted within the Interior Department provided for a drastically smaller park. It would have afforded no protection to Redwood Creek Valley, which has the best surviving stand of primeval redwoods. But it would have been much more acceptable to the commercial interests that want to saw these ancient trees—some of them more than 2,000 years old—into lumber for use as building material, fenceposts, and similar purposes.

Public protests against this timidly conceived, grossly inadequate plan led to the last-minute "compromise" which the administration sent to Congress yesterday. It is a compromise that will satisfy no one who understands the values at stake in the preservation for all time of these unique, magnificent trees. We note with surprise and regret that Senator Kuchel of California has agreed to sponsor this highly unsatisfactory bill, and with even more surprise and regret that Secretary Udall lends his reputation as a conservationist to such an unworthy compromise.

Only 43,000 acres are to be included in this proposed park. Since this acreage includes two existing State parks, little more than half of the land would be newly protected. Moreover, fewer than 7,000 acres would consist of primeval redwoods. The Redwood Creek Valley would remain available for private exploitation—except for one pathetically small enclosure of 1,400 acres, isolated from the rest of the park.

Buying up these redwood lands from private owners would be expensive, but dollars cannot be decisive when the asset is irreplaceable. As President Johnson so eloquently said in his message, "Despite all of our wealth and knowledge, we cannot create a redwood forest, a wild river, or a gleaming seashore." We urge Congress to take the President at his word and to create a Redwood National Park worthy of his rhetoric and of the great trees that are an indescribably beautiful part of America's natural heritage.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, immediately after S. 2962 was sent to the desk I introduced an amendment-No. 487-to S. 2962 on behalf of myself and Senator Clark, Senator Douglas, Senator GRUENING, Senator INOUYE, Senator KENNEDY of New York, Senator Ken-NEDY of Massachusetts, Senator Mc-CARTHY, Senator McGEE, Senator Mc-GOVERN, Senator Muskie, Senator Nelson, Senator Neuberger, Senator RIBICOFF, Senator Typings, and Senator Young of Ohio. Amendment 487 is identical to the Cohelan bill (H.R. 11723) which the Times correctly, in my opin-ion, views as preferable to the administration proposal. My description of the main features of amendment 487, and the organizations which support it. appear on pages 3823 and 3824 of the February 23 Congressional Record.

Those pages of the RECORD also carry Senator Kuchel's and my colloquy which indicates our general agreement on the need for a Redwood National Park although the bill and amendment 487 differ in important respects. We also indicated in our colloquy the desirability of hearings at which different viewpoints will be presented, and the committee members can make a judgment as to how best to serve the public interest.

SNCC PLANS "FREE D.C. MOVEMENT"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, earlier this week the director of the Washington office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee-SNCC-Marion Barry, Jr., issued a press release at a news conference saying that a new program was being launched here in the District of Columbia in support of home rule. "The District of Columbia is still in political slavery," Mr. Barry stated, and he added that the "Free D.C. Movement" intended to launch a "grassroots and communitywide" campaign to protest the lack of the right to vote in the District of Columbia. Buttons and bumper strips are to be sold and distributed, and rallies are to be held on the streets, in churches, and in people's homes all over the city.

Every merchant and businessman will be asked, according to the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, February 22, to first, sign petitions for home rule; second, send telegrams to the President and Congress urging passage of home rule legislation; third, display "Free D.C." emblems, and, fourth, raise \$100,000 in contributions for a new "Merchants' and

Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C."
According to the Star:

All merchants who fail to participate in all 4 steps of the campaign, will be listed in some 100,000 leaflets to be distributed in the District and residents would be asked to boycott them.

The Star article also stated:

Senator ROBERT BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, John L. McMillan, Democrat, of South Carolina, and the board of trade were singled out as special targets for their opposition to home rule by Marion Barry, SNCC director.

The Washington Post of Tuesday, February 22, stated that the group "made its first calls yesterday under plans to visit the owners of some 7,000 businesses in Washington." The Post said that each merchant "will be asked to sign a petition in support of home rule" and to display a "Free D.C." sticker on his window as well as "make a contribution to a fund to be used to publicize this year's home rule drive." According to the Post, merchants who refuse will be named by the movement in its call for a boycott, and, Barry was quoted by the Post as saying:

We will not waste any time begging these businessmen to sign.

The article stated that Barry indicated that the first of the merchants who refused will be identified "at another press conference later this week, probably on Thursday."

The Post said that support for the group was "pledged by the Reverend Walter E. Fauntroy and Suffragan Bishop Paul Moore, Jr., of the Episcopal diocese here. Bishop Moore, according to the Post, stressed that the matter "is not a black-white issue, but one that has to do with freedom and justice."

Mr. Barry, in his press release said:

We want to free District of Columbia from our enemies—the people who make it impossible for us to do anything about lousy schools, brutal cops, welfare investigators who go on midnight raids—

And he went on to say:

The people in this city are tired of gestapo cops who break into their homes illegally and arrest them on flimsy charges * * * tired of a school system that causes 18,000 students to drop out of school in 5 years while during that same period only 15,000 students graduated * * * tired of Senator Robert Byrd taking bread away from hungry children by making it almost impossible for families to receive welfare aid in District of Columbia.

A statement was also issued by John W. Diggs, chairman of the self-styled Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free District of Columbia, saying that he had "decided to head a committee of the merchants and businessmen to help free District of Columbia and get the vote here" and that each merchant and businessman would be asked to "send telegrams in support of the right to vote to President Johnson, Congressman John McMillan, Senator Robert BYRD, and House Speaker John Mc-Mr. Diggs said that the CORMACK." committee has "set its goal at \$100,000," which will be used to "run ads here in Washington and across the country" and "to do a number of other things in

our right-to-vote campaign." Merchants will be asked to make contributions to the committee, and those who refuse to sign petitions in support of the campaign will be boycotted. He said:

This is what we intend to do and what we are going to do.

The petition which merchants and businessmen of the metropolitan Washington area will be coerced into signing will urge the Congress to grant to citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote and the right to elect a mayor and city council as the governing body of the Nation's Capital City.

Mr. President, I see nothing wrong with a group of citizens banding themselves together in a movement to press for legislation which they deem desirable. I see nothing wrong in their petitioning the President and Members of Congress urging that certain legislation be passed. The sending of telegrams to the offices of Members of Congress is something which occurs daily. The solicitation of contributions in support of a political ob-

jective is nothing new.

If the activities of the announced new movement were to be confined to the foregoing, I do not see how any fault could be found with such a program. However, the movement is reportedly not intended or designed to stop here; the announcements of the leaders of the movement indicate that a campaign of extortion, intimidation, and coercion will be leveled against all businessmen and merchants-large and small, Negro and white-who refuse to sign the petition and place cold cash into the hands of the newly formed committee. In other words, while the leaders of this movement speak of the right to vote. they publicly deny the individual merchant's right to his own opinion about home rule. They loudly proclaim themselves the self-styled liberators of the city from political slavery, and, in the same voice, announce their intentions to crush, by resorting to an economic boycott, the individual merchant's right to his own viewpoint. The leader of SNCC says, "We can't hurt McMillan and Byrn, but we can hurt the moneylord merchants of this city." This threat is ominously reminiscent of Los Angeles. One wonders if the SNCC leader has paused to consider that anything which hurts the moneylord merchants and businessmen of this city will hurt the people who make up the membership of SNCC. The SNCC leader says that "The merchants are in business because we support them with our money," and, "if we withdraw our support then they will no longer be around to oppose us." SNCC's leader contemplated the lot of some of his own followers should the day come when the merchants and business-men would "no longer be around?"

SNCC's leader speaks of a school system that "causes 18,000 students to drop out of school in 5 years while during that same period only 15,000 students graduated." My office only this morning received information from Mr. John Riecks of the District of Columbia Board of Education, to the effect that, for the period 1961 through 1965, inclusive, the total number of dropouts in junior and

senior high schools was 10,682, while the total number of 12th grade graduates was 18,245. Apparently, Mr. Barry used the number of students who dropped out of school from the 1st to the 12th grades, which would include those who transferred to private schools and those who left the city and transferred to new schools. In any event, a school system does not cause students to drop out of school; the fault lies elsewhere with dropouts. In many instances, students are simply dropouts by nature, and they will continue to be dropouts through life. It is convenient in these days to blame the school system or to blame society for school dropouts, for misfits, for sexual perverts, for youthful criminals, but may not the blame lie elsewhere?

The SNCC spokesman refers to gestapo cops" who break into people's homes "illegally." If cops are breaking into homes illegally, procedures are available for adequate redress, but what evidence is there to support this extremist charge? He refers to "lousy schools" but chooses to say nothing of the 27,689 windowpanes smashed in District of Columbia schools by rock throwers, the replacement of which cost the taxpayers \$112,868. These were the figures given at last year's hearings. He refers to brutal cops' but ignores the brutality of mobs which converge upon police stations to threaten and abuse cops for having done their duty, as happened last September in the 10th precinct.

Such banal statements as these from a SNCC spokesman have become so commonplace, Mr. President, as to be almost

unworthy of comment.

What should cause serious soul-searching, however, is the support given to such an irresponsible, questionable, and dangerous movement by certain members of the clergy who were present at the press conference. In particular, I am concerned with the radical statements attributed to the Episcopal Bishop Moore, and I quote from the Post:

He said he was "sorry that this kind of militancy is necessary" but that all other methods of dealing with the problem had falled.

In other words, you do what he directs or he will apply militancy tactics. This does not sound like the religious leadership, understanding, and tolerance that give significance to our Christian inheritance.

Mr. President, anyone who cares to look the facts in the eye cannot fail to be impressed with the utter arrogance of these self-styled and self-imposed leaders who intend to cow or overawe all who do not immediately fall into line, even against an individual's own better judgment as to what is best for himself and his own city. The demand for a contribution, with the threat of an economic boycott hanging over the merchant victims' head, constitutes nothing short of a high-handed shakedown. Those merchants who may have the courage of their convictions and whose considered judgment leads them to believe that home rule is not in the best interests of the Nation's Capital, may get their windows smashed for their pains, and the

very least injury that can befall them will be the attempted economic destruction of their businesses. In other words, any means to an end, and, if force is required, use it. This would appear to be the order of the day.

Mr. President, who will be held responsible for the handling and dispensing of the contributions that are expected to pour in under duress? How will even the merchant who conscientiously supports home rule be assured that his dollars will be spent in behalf of the cause? The "Free D.C." committee says that it intends to match the moneys which the Board of Trade is purportedly planning to spend against home rule. I know nothing about the Washington Board of Trade's plans in this regard. But, if the Board of Trade does intend to spend money in opposition to home rule, at least there is no indication that it proposes to blackjack merchants into making contributions under duress and under the threat of an economic blitzkrieg. If the "Free D.C." committee can extort money for this cause, if it can blackmail merchants and businessmen into complying with its brazen demands, what can it do next? Who will be the target of its next ultimatum? What will be the next cause celebre for which it may exact money tribute?

Who will be held to an accounting of the ways in which one-tenth of a million dollars is to be spent? Who will be bonded? What books will be audited and who will do the auditing? Are those persons who are forced to contribute against their will, to have a voice in determining how their moneys are to be spent?

Mr. President, the actions of this SNCC group and its allies should now make it crystal clear, even to the blindest man, that, if home rule ever comes again to the District of Columbia, it probably will not, in reality, be home rule, but, rather, it may be rule by pressure group. The very thing I am talking about here today is a case in point. The Nation's Capital was recently subjected to a bus boycott, of which, according to the Evening Star of January 25, Mr. Barry was the main sponsor. That boycott was termed an overwhelming success by its promoters. Now, an economic boycott is going to be used as the ultimate weapon against merchants and businessmen who are bold enough to differ in their viewpoints from those expressed by leaders of the pressure movement. What clear and more convincing example is needed to show the people of the Nation what their Capital City is in for, if home rule comes to this city, than the example of this Damocles sword being dangled over the hapless heads of Washington businessmen by these self-crowned liberators from political slavery who have launched a campaign of coercion and intimidation to achieve their self-declared objectives?

Mr. President, the most unfortunate aspect of this battle cry of SNCC is its irresponsible flouting of the democratic processes of government. We all accept the exertion of legitimate pressures upon us as legislators from the various segments of the population, and telegrams and other expressions of opinion are

normal to the right of petition and the legislative process, but we are witnessing here attempts to influence government by intimidation and coercion. By singling out Members of the Congress, including myself, who have important responsibilities in the handling of the affairs of the District of Columbia, and by proposing to force unwilling businessmen to contribute or be subjected to economic boycott, SNCC and its allies have resorted to the most blatant and unfair type of coercion. One cannot accept these actions as morally justifiable. I cannot believe that legislation enacted in such an atmosphere would be in the best interests of the District. Above all, a campaign to get a war chest of \$100,000 to be raised by calls on businessmen sounds ominously like Chicago in the days of Al Capone's extortion rackets. It is shocking to see a repetition of this today in the Capital of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article written by Larry A. Still, entitled "Businesses Face Threat of Home Rule Boycott," published in the Evening Star of February 22, 1966; the article published in the Washington Post for February 22, 1966, entitled "Store Boycott Planned by New Rights Group Supporting Home Rule;" the press release of February 21, 1966, put out by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, on the statement by Marion Barry, Jr.; and a statement and petition of February 21, 1966, on this subject.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 22, 1966]
BUSINESSES FACE THREAT OF HOME RULE
BOYCOTT

(By Larry A. Still)

Details of a plan to coerce District businessmen into supporting home rule legislation by threatening them with a boycott were announced yesterday by three local civil rights groups.

Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Suffragan Episcopal bishop, joined spokesmen from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the D.C. Coalition of Conscience in urging support of the campaign among 7,000 District merchants.

TO ANNOUNCE TARGETS

"We are sorry this kind of militancy is necessary to bring to people the right to vote," Bishop Moore declared, "but all other methods have failed. We have tried lobbying, polite talk and even picketing and demonstrations."

Banding together as the "Free D.C. Movement," spokesmen for the groups said businessmen will be asked to (1) sign petitions for home rule, (2) send telegrams to the President and Congress urging passage of home rule legislation, (3) display "Free D.C." emblems and (4) raise \$100,000 in contributions to a new "Merchants and Businessmen's Committee to Free D.C."

John W. Diggs, a northeast barber and chairman of the committee, said the first targets of the boycott will be announced Thursday after a conference with the representatives of a major department store and a large grocery chain.

All merchants who fail to participate in all four steps of the campaign will be listed in some 100,000 leaflets to be distributed in the District, and residents would be asked to boycott them "step by step," Diggs said.

Diggs said the \$100,000 was being sought to run advertisements in newspapers across the country "to counteract" a Board of Trade

campaign against home rule.

Senator Robert Byrd, Democrat, of West Virginia, Representative John L. McMillan, Democrat, of South Carolina, and the Board of Trade were singled out as special targets for their opposition to home rule by Marion Barry, SNCC director.

CITES WHITE SUPPORT

In endorsing the boycott tactic, Bishop Moore declared: "I want to make it crystal clear this is not a black and white issue. There are a number of District residents." he added, "who are white and clearly support this issue."

He said the campaign was decided on because "the business community has been using the money of the community to fight against justice and citizenship for the people who live in the community."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1966] STORE BOYCOTT PLANNED BY NEW RIGHTS GROUP SUPPORTING HOME RULE

Plans to call a consumer boycott against all Washington merchants who refuse to support District home rule were announced yesterday by a new civil rights group.

terday by a new civil rights group.

The aims of the new Free District of Columbia Movement were described at a press conference by Marion Barry, Jr., director of the Washington office of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee.

Support for the group was pledged by Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy and Suffragan Bishop Paul Moore, Jr., of the Episcopal Diocese here, cochairman of the District of Columbia Coalition of Conscience, and by Rev. Edward A. Hailes, executive director of the Washington NAACP branch.

Barry said the movement will work against those he termed "moneylord merchants" who have teamed with "white segregationists" in Congress to block passage of home rule legis-

The group made its first calls yesterday under plans to visit the owners of some 7,000 businesses in Washington.

SUPPORT DEMANDED

Each merchant will be asked to sign a petition in support of home rule; to send telegrams supporting it to President Johnson and certain Members of Congress; to display a "Free District of Columbia" sticker on his window, and to make a contribution to a fund to be used to publicize this year's home rule drive.

Merchants who refuse will be named by the movement in its call for a boycott.

"We will not waste any time begging these businessmen to sign," Barry said, adding that the first of the merchants who refuse will be identified at another press conference later this week, probably on Thursday.

Actual contact with the 7,000 businesses and solicitation of funds will be done by the Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C., headed by John W. Diggs, owner of a barbershop and beauty salon in Washington.

BOARD OF TRADE HIT

Diggs said that the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade is raising \$100,000 to fight home rule this year and that the same amount is therefore being sought from merchants who favor self-government for Washington.

A spokesman for the board of trade denied that the organization is building up a fund to combat home rule. He had no comment on the boycott proposal.

Barry charged that those who oppose giving Washingtonians the right to elect their own officials are keeping the city in "political slavery."

"We want to free District of Columbia from our enemies—the people who make it impossible for us to do anything about lousy schools, brutal cops, slumlords, welfare investigators who go on midnight raids, employers who discriminate in hiring and a host of other ills that run rampant through our city," he said.

Bishop Moore stressed that the matter "is not a black-white issue, but one that has to do with freedom and justice."

He said he was "sorry that this kind of militancy is necessary" but that all other methods of dealing with the problem had folled

Mr. Fauntroy, pastor of New Bethel Baptist Church at 1739 S Street NW., where the press conference was held, declared that opposition to home rule is centered "in a small group of businessmen who do not wish to relinquish the inordinant power over the city which they have under the present system."

[Press release of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Washington, D.C., Feb. 21, 1966]

STATEMENT BY MARION BARRY, JR.

Ladies and gentlemen of the press, I am Marion Barry, Jr., director of the Washington office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). The purpose of this news conference is to give some details about a new program that is being launched here in the District of Columbia—a grassroots and communitywide campaign for the right to vote for District of Columbia residents.

Washington, D.C., the capital of the Nation, is the only place in this country that is governed solely by Congress and where 900,000 people do not have the legal right to elect their own local government. This is political slavery

political slavery.

Negroes and whites have been beaten, jailed and even killed for trying to get the right to vote in the South—and for trying to get Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965. But, that act has no meaning for the District of Columbia. The President appoints the Commissioners and the District judges; and, the judges in turn appoint the District school board; 900,000 district residents have no voice in District affairs. District of Columbia is still in political slavery.

The House of Representatives, led by a racist from South Carolina—John McMilan, has refused to free us. The House of Representatives has refused to give the right to vote to 900,000 District residents. Therefore we are launching a campaign to free District of Columbia.

We want to free District of Columbia from our enemies—the people who make it impossible for us to do anything about lousy schools, brutal cops, slumlords, welfare investigators who go on midnight raids, employers who discriminate in hiring, and a host of other ills that run rampant through our city.

The people in this city are tired of gestapo cops who break into their homes illegally and arrest them on filmsy charges.

The people in this city are tired of a school system that causes 18,000 students to drop out of school in 5 years while during that some period only 15,000 students graduated.

The people in this city are tired of the way

that landlord and tenant court is run. They are tired of the court being run for the benefit of the slumlords and not for the tenants.

The people in this city are tired of Senator ROBERT BYRD taking bread away from hungry children by making it all but impossible for families to receive welfare aid in the District of Columbia.

But, being tired is not enough. Talk is not enough. It takes more than that and we do intend to do more.

Who is it that keeps the District of Columbia in political slavery? The southern white segregationists led by John McMillan have gotten together with the moneylord mer-

chants of this city to oppose our right to vote. Congressman McMillan praises Mr. Davis, head of the Board of Trade, for opposing our right to vote. The moneylord merchants want to keep control of the city; they don't want the people to control their city.

We can't hurt Congressman McMillan or Senator Byrd but we can hurt the moneylord merchants of this city. The merchants are in business because we support them with our money. If we withdraw our support then they will no longer be around to oppose us. If the merchants who oppose our right to vote are our enemies, then why should we continue to support our enemies?

We have formed a movement for a free District of Columbia. This Free D.C. Movement will launch a campaign to protest the lack of the right to vote in the District of Columbia. We will distribute 75,000 to 100,000 leaflets with the following cartoon. We will sell and distribute buttons, bumper strips with the following design and we will hold rallies—on the streets, in churches and people's homes—in all sections of the city.

people's homes—in all sections of the city.

The Free D.C. Movement is going to work very closely with Mr. John W. Diggs, chairman of the Merchants and Businessmen's Committee to Free D.C. The merchant's committee will begin immediately to circulate a merchants petition to free the District of Columbia (Mr. Diggs will talk about that himself a bit later). The Free D.C. Movement has agreed to launch a boycott against those merchants who do not sign the free District of Columbia petition and display the free District of Columbia emblem in their windows.

We don't intend to wait; we are going to begin this program now. Our enemies are going to make this seem like a black-white issue, but it is not. This is a fight between those who want the right to vote and those who would keep us in political slavery—be they black or white.

Finally, there are rumors presently circulating that I am interested in political office in this city. I want to make it very clear that I am not interested in political office and that I have no desire to run for any office here or in any other city. I am interested in and will work for the day when residents of the District of Columbia have the right to vote.

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. DIGGS, CHARMAN, MERCHANTS AND BUSINESSMEN'S COMMITTEE TO FREE D.C., FEBRUARY 21, 1966

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is John W. Diggs. I am 50 years old and have lived in the District for 25 years. I own and operate the River Terrace Barber Shop at 3425 Benning Road NE. and Margo's Beauty Salon at 308 Riggs Road NE. I would consider myself a small businessman.

There is no question in my mind that the majority of the citizens in this community want the right to elect their own local officials—the right of self-government—and they want it now. Furthermore, I feel that a large segment of the business community also would like self-government for the District of Columbia.

I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Barry when he says that we should support our friends and withdraw our support from those who oppose our right to vote. Therefore I have decided to head a committee of merchants and businessmen to help free the District of Columbia and get the vote here.

In order for us to find out who our friends are, the committee will do the following: Circulate a petition.

In addition, the committee will ask each merchant and businessman to:

 Send telegrams in support of the right to vote to President Johnson, Congressman John McMillan, Senator Robert Byrd, and House Speaker John McCormack. 2. Make a contribution to the Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C.

I would like to explain the last point. It is my understanding that the board of trade is raising or has raised \$100,000 to oppose our right to vote. Therefore, we have to raise money to counteract this force and to fight for our right to vote. We will need money to run ads here in Washington and across the country. We will need money to do a number of other things in our right-to-vote cam-Since the board of trade raises its paign. money from its members, it seems only proper that the money to support the Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C. should come from merchants and businessmen. We will ask each merchant who agrees with us to make a contribution in proportion to the size of his business. In other words, larger businessmen would be expected to give more than, say, the small grocery owner. The Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C. has set its goal at \$100,000. If a merchant or businessman agrees to the above, he will get a "Free D.C." sticker that he would put on his door or window. This would show he is our friend.

If a merchant or businessman doesn't sign, then we would turn his name over to the Free D.C. Movement. The Free D.C. Movement has agreed to work closely with us and would call a boycott of the merchants that don't support us.

This is what we intend to do and what we

are going to do.

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON MERCHANTS AND BUSINESSMEN'S PETITION TO CONGRESS IN SUPPORT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

We, the undersigned merchants and businessmen of the Metropolitan Washington area, hereby petition the Congress of the United States to pass legislation during the first months of the 2d session of the 89th Congress to grant to the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote, the right to elect a mayor and city council as the governing body of the Nation's Capital City.

We, the undersigned merchants and businessmen of the Metropolitan Washington area, wish to express to the Congress of the United States our sentiment and our support for the rights of the citizens of all parts of our country and we wish to express our extreme resentment of those who have professed to speak for the business community of this great Capital City of our society on this crucial issue, the right to over, the right

We, the undersigned merchants and businessmen of the Metropolitan Washington area, decry the cruel disenfranchisement of the citizens of the Nation's Capital and the shame and disgrace which this disenfranchisement brings to our great country throughout the world. We wish to bring to the attention of the Congress that this Nation was founded by those men who had the courage of their convictions and who protested and demanded that taxation without representation end forever between the shores of the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. We demand that the Congress wipe forever from the unfortunate deeds and acts of our country this blot, this inequity against its people.

Therefore, we, the undersigned merchants and businessmen of the Metropolitan Washington area, hereby pledge our complete physical and financial support to this great cause. We proudly add our name to the long list of those leaders of our community who have joined in this common cause.

JOHN W. DIGGS, Chairman, the Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2791

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without

objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, lying on the desk is my amendment No. 481, cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] to the pending bill, S. 2791.

This amendment relates to the need for congressional approval for the sending of draftees to southeast Asia involuntarily. The consent of Congress would be required in order to have draftees sent to southeast Asia.

My amendment reads as follows:

On page 3, after line 8, add the following new section:

"Sec. 302. During any period that any armed force of the United States is engaged in armed conflict or hostilities in southeast Asia, no person who is a member of that armed force serving on active duty by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to perform duty in such area, unless (1) such person volunteers for service in such area, or (2) the Congress hereafter authorizes by law the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into such armed forces."

At the appropriate time, I shall call up my amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on it so that the American people can have—as they deserve to have—a clear expression of congressional intent on the use of draftees in the present undeclared war in Vietnam.

I appreciate the fact that this subject came up for discussion during the hearings, on the pending measure, before the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Department of Defense of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. On this point the hearing record of this joint committee is most

interesting in that it discloses that while the question was repeatedly raised as to why draftees are being sent to Vietnam while the reserves remain untouched and while we maintain a force of over 350,000 trained men in Europe, the answers supplied by the Department of Defense are completely unsatisfactory as will be seen when I analyze them presently.

It seems to me that this is a question on which the parents of draftees and potential draftees—and the draftees and potential draftees themselves—have a right to have the fullest possible debate in Congress and which Congress itself should decide.

Before I proceed to the analysis, I shall review briefly the facts with respect to the proposed legislation. I have stated them on the floor of the Senate before, but I believe they deserve a review now.

I had intended to offer a similar amendment to the defense appropriation bill, then pending in the Senate, some 6 months ago, almost to the day, on August 20, 1965. That morning the President asked to see me at the White House. The purpose of our meeting was to enable me to explain to the President in detail my opposition to our military involvement in Vietnam, which I had been voicing on the floor of the Senate for a year and a half.

I told the President that I disagreed completely with his administration's position; namely, that three Presidents had pledged support to this policy—that there was in fact no national pledge or an unavoidable commitment—that we had in fact asked ourselves into Vietnam. I also elaborated on my other reasons for believing that our involvement was folly—that it was a war we could not win—that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disaster.

While there, after I expressed my views, I told him I intended to introduce an amendment that very afternoon forbidding draftees to be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without the consent of the Congress. The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment. He said that in any event no draftees would be sent to Vietnam before January. After repeating his request that I take no such action, he said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased. Of course, I would be free in any event, without his permission; but under those circumstances, and in accordance with the President's urgent request that I not offer the amendment at that time, and his hopeful expectation that our troops would be out of Vietnam by January, I naturally refrained from submitting the amendment.

Immediately upon returning to my office, I sent the President, by special messenger, a copy of my proposed amendment and the remarks I had prepared to make in support of it on that afternoon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks my letter of August 20, 1965, to the President.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, 6 months have now elapsed. We are still bogged down in an undeclared war in Vietnam which threatens to escalate into a third world war, and the price of which in any event, in lives and other costs. would be staggering.

While I disapprove entirely of our military involvement in Vietnam, it becomes clear that those who have enlisted in any of the Armed Forces—the so-called Regulars-have an obligation to go where their Commander in Chief sends them. As in the case of the 600 gallant men who took part in the Charge of the Light Brigade:

> Theirs not to reason why: Theirs but to do and die.

But an entirely different situation prevails when we reach into millions of American families and conscript these youths to fight involuntarily in this hopeless mess.

Since there apparently is no intention to ask for a declaration of war, this amendment will serve as a vehicle for Members of Congress to express themselves on an issue which strikes home in a literal sense.

Mr. President, I now analyze the testimony which took place in the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations on this subject matter.

As I said, the answers were rather unsatisfactory. I shall read portions of the testimony. It states:

Senator STENNIS .-

There is then the word "deleted" in brackets. There are some 900 deletions in the testimony presented at this hearing which lasted 5 days. That makes it rather difficult for those who were not present at the hearings to find out what the specific answers to definite questions posed by committee members were.

AUGMENTATION OF FORCES

Senator STENNIS. [Deleted.] On personnel, you are calling in 300,000 extra men, that is, augmenting our Regular Forces by that many. Let me put it this way. We have many. Let me put it this way. We have around 2 million reserves in all, do we not, in round numbers?

Secretary McNamara. About 1 million on paid status.

Senator STENNIS. And we are having to augment these other forces by an increased

CALL-UP OF RESERVE FORCES

Why don't we call up some of these Reserve units? Many of them are trained, and we

have spent money on them.

Secretary McNamara. Yes, I think that is a very fundamental question, Senator STEN-NIS, and we have considered it and decided not to for two reasons: One, we think it is more equitable under present circumstances to use the draft, and to use men who have not fulfilled their obligated service. About 70 percent of the officers of the Reserve and Guard Forces, for example, if I recall correctly, have completed obligated service and if they were to be called back would be fulfilling military service for terms in excess of those that others in our society have completed. Therefore, from a point of view of equity, it seemed wise to avoid use of the Reserves if we could.

I shall presently introduce an article from this morning's New York Times concerning this statement. It appears that in the short interval since Secretary McNamara testified 3 weeks ago, he may have changed his mind and is now thinking about calling up the Armed Reserves.

I continue to read:

Two, the Reserves, under the conditions under which we would be allowed to call them up, would probably be a perishable commodity. You may remember that in 1961 when the Reserves were called up, they were called for a term of 1 year under the provisions of the law. In this instance, if they were called for 1 year, it would be necessary, simultaneously, to activate new units in the Regular Forces so that we could replace the Reserves at the end of the year, and for that reason it seemed undesirable to call the

Senator STENNIS. You have no plans to call any of them now, not even specialist units?

Secretary McNamara. Not unless the requirements exceed the levels that we are now planning upon. But in anticipation that they might exceed those levels and. therefore, that it might be necessary to call Reserves, we have, as you know, undertaken to increase the strength of certain units known as "Selected Forces" so as to raise their combat readiness and have them prepared for duty if that becomes necessary in the future. But at present we have no plans to call them.

Senator STENNIS. Well, to consider the equities of the situation, it is not particularly pleasant under any circumstances for anybody to be called, but these men you are body to be called, but these likely you are talking about, 70 percent of them at least, went into this voluntarily beyond their or-dinary military service, did they not? Secretary McNamara. Oh, yes; you are quite right. They have volunteered for it.

FUNCTION OF RESERVE FORCES

Senator STENNIS. I thought that is what Reserves were for. It is part of our military strength, what we provide for every year.

Secretary McNamara. I think it was felt the primary purpose of the Reserve was to fulfill a need that we couldn't fulfill by the draft or by volunteers. We think that we can accomplish our present force goals and deployments without recalling Reserves, by relying on the draft and volunteers.

USE OF RESERVES IN NONACTIVE STATUS

Senator STENNIS. What about the hundred thousand men who have volunteered for the Reserve program in lieu of being inducted? They are inductees to a degree. They are put in the Reserve and they are now in a nonactive status. You say you have no facilities to train them.

Secretary McNamara. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. You have about a hundred thousand; isn't that right?

Secretary McNamara. Let me check it. Senator STENNIS. Around that number. What are your plans for them?

Secretary McNamara. Well, the number as of the end of fiscal year 1966, a few months from now, we think will be about 135,000. Senator STENNIS. Yes.

Secretary McNamara. At the end of last fiscal year it was about 32,000. Our plan is to train them as rapidly as our training system can accept them. The untrained backlog was 46,000 at the end of fiscal 1964 and at the end of 1967 it is anticipated it could grow perhaps 11,000 over the 135,000 now anticipated for end fiscal year 1966, depending upon the training system capacity in 1967. Currently we plan on training 52,000 of these men in fiscal year 1966 and 135,000 in fiscal year 1967.

Senator STENNIS. Isn't there some way to reach those men and put them in active

service? They have not served a day's active duty: have they?

Secretary McNamara. That is right. Senator STENNIS. Or even training?

Secretary McNamara. The point is that we don't need them in the Active Force now. We are taking all the men we can absorb in our training system for the Active Force at the present time. These are men that have a right to volunteer so long as we have a requirement for them, and under the terms of the present legislation, we are required to raise the force level of the Reserve and Guard and, therefore, we have to accept their enlistments. But-

Senator STENNIS. You have to accept their enlistment?

Secretary McNamara. In order to fill our present prescribed totals of 270,000 and 380,-000 men for the Army Reserve and Guard, respectively. Moreover, we don't wish to push them into the Active Force at this time for training because to do so would mean we would have to set up more cadres. set up these training cadres, we would have to tear down the combat units of the Active Force. That is why our training capacity is limited at the present time and that is why these men will be trained in 1967 rather than in 1966.

RESERVE ACTIVATION

Senator MUNDT. Have you been asked to answer-it may have happened when I was out of the room-questions about any plans you have for the possible activation of the Reserve?

Secretary McNamara. I was asked if we planned to call Reserves at any time in the near future and I answered, no. We have no intentions of calling them at any time in the near future but we recognize that circumstances may change and may make such a call desirable. In anticipation of that, we ask authority of the Congress to expend funds to increase the combat readiness of selected Reserve Force units and additional funds for that purpose are provided in this supplemental.

Senator Mundr. I ask it only because I have heard from a couple of reservists who think, should they sell their business or do something, there is no reason they should change their economic lives—

Secretary McNamara. No, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Because of the imminence of that? Secretary McNamara. No, sir; there is not,

with the qualification that circumstances may change and we may have to call them.

ARMY AND MARINE POSITION ON DRAFT VERSUS RESERVE CALLUP

Senator Thurmond. Mr. Secretary, does the Army agree with you it is most desirable to increase the manpower by using the draft enlistments rather than by calling up the Reserves?

Secretary McNamara. In the first place, let me say that up to the present time we have met all of General Westmoreland's requirements, on time, with the exception of about [deleted] men [deleted].

I think the Army leaders might have preferred to call up certain selected personnel, but not including major combat units.

The Marines, in particular, opposed the callup of the Marine Reserve division unless it were to be sent into combat in Vietnam. Were that to be done, of course, and assuming it were called up under legislation similar to that passed in 1961 it would be a perishable asset because the reserves were called for only a 1-year period. And neither I nor the Chiefs would want to send a division to Vietnam if we could anticipate only 12 months of service from the time it was called up to the time it had to be returned to reserve status. So generally speaking, I think that up to the present time we are better off having relied upon the draft and volunteers than we would have been had we called the Reserves.

Senator Thurmond. Does the Army agree with you that it is more desirable to increase the manpower by using the draft and enlistments rather than calling up the Reserves?

Secretary McNamara. Without question, I think they agree on the major combat units. With respect to some specialists I think they might have preferred to call Reserves.

Mr. President, I submit that that is an unsatisfactory and inadequate explanation of why we have called in draftees.

In Parade magazine for January 30, 1966, distributed with the Washington Post, there appeared a brief description of draft practices in a number of other countries. I ask unanimous consent that this description be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, with respect to sending draftees to Vietnam, the following is indeed significant:

In South Vietnam all men, 18-35, face 3 years of military service. A large percentage of South Vietnamese conscripts desert each year. South Vietnam hires mercenaries to fight against the Vietcong. We support the South Vietnamese economy. Without us that country would go broke. Whether indirectly we are paying the South Vietnamese mercenaries is a question Washington declines to answer.

Mr. President, of course we pay for the mercenaries.

In connection with these mercenaries, we read in this morning's New York Times an article headed "1965 Desertions Up in Saigon Forces—Total Is Put Above 96,000—U.S. Aides Concerned." The article is dated Saigon, February 23. It is written by Neil Sheehan, in a special dispatch to the New York Times. The article begins:

About 96,000 men deserted from the South Vietnamese armed forces last year, a total equivalent to nearly half of the American force that has been committed to the defense of this country.

So while we are reaching into every American home, taking our young men as draftees and sending them to the slaughter in southeast Asia, 96,000 of the South Vietnamese forces have deserted in the last year. This is the kind of war we are asked to fight with the blood of our young men, when the people in the armed forces there are unwilling to defend their own country, and are leaving the ranks and deserting by the tens of thousands. Of course, no punishment is meted out to them, and we Americans continue to pay those who remain in the service. This is a shocking situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, "1965 Desertions Up in Saigon Forces—Total Is Put Above 96,000," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. I likewise ask unanimous consent, in connection with Secretary McNamara's positive statements at the recent hearings on S. 2791 that there was no intention of calling up the Reserves at this time, that an article published likewise in today's New York

Times, Thursday, February 24, headed "McNamara Hints Call-Up of Reservists for Vietnam"—indicating that there is little stability or assurance that the assurances and the promises made in one week are not going to be reversed in the next—be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. GRUENING. It is, of course, obvious, since Vietnam is receiving budget support in large amounts from the United States, that the United States is footing the bill for such of these mercenaries as have not deserted. It is a sad commentary indeed that Vietnamese must be paid to defend the so-called freedoms of their own country while we are conscripting draftees here in the United States to send to Vietnam to fight side by side with these mercenaries, and to take the places of those who are deserting the Army presumably fighting the cause of their own country.

It should be noted that when France was fighting in Vietnam to recolonize that country, it used no draftees. By an amendment to the French budget law of 1950, draftees raised under the French military draft were not permitted to be used outside of the territory of the French Republic except under a situation of declared war. No draftees were used in Indochina at all after 1949.

The United States with respect to waging an undeclared war in Vietnam is in the same position as France until the fifties and, absent a declaration of war or a clear expression of congressional intent in lieu thereof, draftees should not be sent to Vietnam involuntarily.

Mr. President, I have received a tremendous amount of correspondence on this subject since it was first known that I was planning to offer my proposed amendment. I have received hundreds of letters which reveal great alarm and distress. They come from every part of the country.

I do not intend to put all of them in the Record, but I shall read from a few of them, to give Congress and the people of the United States an idea of the deep concern and worry that exists in the hearts of the American people concerning the proposal to conscript draftees and send them to South Vietnam.

It is my hope that Congress, under my amendment, will have a chance to register its views, and let the people of the United States know just where each Member stands.

Here is a letter from Fordham University, New York. It says:

Dear Senator Gruening: I have just read a corrected description in the Times on your proposed amendment to the supplemental defense appropriations bill, and want you to know I wholeheartedly support the measure. Legalized involuntary servitude is perhaps the greatest offense against civil liberty possible in a free society such as ours; and for the Government to coerce a man into fighting a war he does not support is clearly a violation of the 13th amendment to the Constitution prohibiting involuntary servitude. The complexity and seeming hopelessness of the Vietnam situation only aggravate such infringements of personal liberty.

Thank you for proposing the amendment; I hope your proposal gets the widespread Senate approval which it certainly deserves.

I would appreciate your informing me of the progress of your amendment in the days to come.

Very truly yours,

Here is a letter from a housewife in Vancouver, Wash.:

DEAR SENATOR: As a lifelong Democrat, I am fast becoming an admirer of yours and always have been of Senator Morse, and I wondered if you were aware—I bet you are—of the high wages paid civilian employers in Vietnam.

A member of my family who has a prison record, and won't be drafted, is a second-rate welder.

He has signed up to go to Vietnam for 3 years with some contractor banking \$55,000 for him. The Government can turn around and draft my son, 20, who has worked his way through 2 years of college (still going) and has never been in trouble in his life. He has also never lived as he hasn't been able to afford to date a girl since his senior year in high school. He hasn't been able to find a part-time job that doesn't interfere with his classes, and if he did, he probably couldn't keep his grades up.

His ambition has always been to be a history teacher—which he has always done "A" work in. Now I read that the Army will take the history and English majors before mathematics and science majors. He and I both feel Vietnam is sure suicide. It isn't something to die for. We would both fight for our country, but we feel this war is wrong. I have three sons, no education, work hard to just give my kids room and board.

It's one thing to die for a cause you believe in, another to throw away all your dreams for a better life for nothing.

I can't get a decent job because of my education (ninth grade). I'm 36 years old and I can't afford to go to school nights because it takes all my husband makes just to feed six people. Yet we need two paychecks to make ends meet and then to read about a civilian employee's wife in Vietnam sending home \$36,000 in money orders in 6 months is too much.

Here is a letter from Arlington Heights, Ill.:

Senator Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: I am a liberal, a Democrat and an ardent supporter of the President, but I applaud your stand to bar the use of draftees in Vietnam.

I believe our involvement there is a diplomatic disaster and a moral tragedy as well.
And, as everyone knows, we have failed militarily, which is not surprising since we can't possibly win (or even survive) a land war in Asia. Therefore, I urge you to do everything within your power to influence the administration to withdraw our forces.

These days one has to listen closely to hear the voices of reason amid the clamor for bombs. But men like you and Senators CLARK, MORSE, and FULBRIGHT have more support than you may realize. What the administration fondly interprets as support of the Vietnam war is not that at all. It is merely a quiet tolerance sustained by a booming economy.

I work for a large corporation and live in a suburban, middle-class neighborhood. I have a college education, a wife and three children, so I hardly represent the longhaired, "ban the bomb" crowd. And I have yet to meet a single person among my friends who supports our policy in Vietnam.

My best wishes to you in the difficult days ahead.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Orlando, Fla.: Senator Gruening, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for joining your small group of erudite, clear-thinking Senators who are unafraid to express their views in the face of all the jingo-istic hoopla of the hawks and "me tooers." It takes courage to leave political expediency and stick to one's honest convictions. Senators Fulbright, Morse, Church, McGovern, and you, and a few more of your colleagues are truly outstanding men, and to be congratulated for your honesty and logical minds.

Eisenhower naively spoke the truth when he spoke at the Governors' Conference in November 1954: "Whoever maintains the sphere of influence in southeast Asia controls the tin, tungsten, rubber, oil, etc." Therein lies the raison d'etre—freedom? Humanitarianism? Commitments to whom or to what?

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Kansas City, Kans.:

DEAR SENATOR: I am certainly in favor of your bill not to send draftees to Vietnam or any foreign wars. Being the mother of five sons, two of whom are already in the service—one just 19 in January—I do not wish to see them sacrificed after 16 weeks training. Boys sent to fight a man's war, when we have men in Reserve units who are well trained for these wars.

We have a unit of brokenhearted mothers ready to wage war.

Here is a letter from Villanova, Pa., from a physician:

DEAR SENATOR: In these dark days with our Nation committed to an illegal, immoral, and militarily psychotic war, it is most encouraging to see that some true Americans in public life will stand up and be counted. Your stand on dragging this issue out into the open and in regard to draftees being sent to southeast Asia are most commendable. Most of all I admire you for standing up and being counted in these days when powerful people think that consensus is more important than truth. Thank you from the bottom of my heart for all that you are doing.

Very truly yours,

Here is a letter from Fort Wayne, Ind.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The recent legislation you have introduced to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in Vietnam is without a doubt the most intelligent action to be taken in this disgraceful mess.

I have personally conducted a survey and have talked to hundreds of people in all walks of life in this area, and the response has been 100 percent in opposition to the administration's present policy in Vietnam and especially the drafting of our young men for this service.

Considering this as a basis I feel that the people of America as a whole will support you in your noble effort.

The most regrettable situation existing in our State, is the fact that our representatives evidently favor this warmongering giveaway program of human life against the will of the people.

I feel certain that I speak for the people of America in commending you and Senator WAYNE MORSE for your effort. May God be with you.

Sincerely yours,

Here is a letter from Berkeley, Calif.: SENATOR GRUENING: This is a note of support for legislation you have introduced to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam.

As a Korean war veteran, I can testify to the fact that a rudimentary knowledge of the army game and a sprinkling of luck is usually sufficient to keep a person out of a combat zone. Most draftees neither have the sophistication nor the opportunity to play the army game due to the rapidity at which they are assigned to combat divisions.

Regular Army men are quick to defend military action and to define themselves as soldiers in every sense of the word. They should be given the opportunity to practice their chosen profession. It is incongruous to have civilian conscripts in the Infantry in Vietnam and soldiers in quartermaster depots in the States. With proper training the draftee is capable of supplying the soldier's needs in the field. In a war of the nature of Vietnam, where there is considerable question as to the extent to which American soil and institutions are threatened, this is certainly all the draftee should be compelled to do.

It might be mentioned in passing that if military service in the lower grades could be made more palatable it is possible fewer draftees would be needed.

Your speeches and comments concerning Vietnam are one of the few lights of reason shining through the present fog of World War II cliches.

Here is a letter from a soldier on active service. His name and unit have been deleted, for obvious reasons. I do not wish to get him into trouble.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Recently I read of your efforts to introduce legislation designed to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam, supplemented by your three logical and intelligent amendments. This letter in support of your legislative efforts which I consider to be of the highest order in the protection of individual freedom and which keeps a man from being reduced to the role of a mere pawn in the hands of statesmen, may have the insignificance in determining the successful outcome of your bill as my vote in determining the President in a national election, yet I offer you my support because symbolically it means as much in its little way in the tradition of American democracy as, on the other hand, the actual importance of your proposal does in defending and propagating that tradition.

Men I have known and served with in units during my one and three-quarter years in the military have volunteered and gone to fight in Vietnam, some for patriotic reasons, some for personal reasons. I admire their courage and their convictions; but for those whose values and political opinions do not lead them to this action your legislation is the means whereby they may express their choice and exercise their liberty.

Here is another letter from a soldier in uniform, likewise, whose name and unit are likewise deleted:

SENATOR GRUENING: Today it was announced on the radio that you and Senator Morse are sponsoring a bill before the present session of Congress which advocates congressional approval of any Presidential action committing draftees abroad. If this is the case I would like to express my unconditional support.

For the past year or so I have followed with great interest the course of our Vietnam involvement. I have also read some excerpts from speeches by you and Senator Morss, among others, on this involvement and I think that I am in complete agreement with you and Senator Morse.

In summary I am dissatisfied with the present involvement as I think that: firstly, the United States became involved there under a President and Secretary of State who

were overcome with their own anti-Communist involvements and acted not on what was there but what they thought was there secondly, because our involvement seems to me a violation of the U.N. Charter and the 1954 Geneva agreements, and thirdly, because we are supporting there a regime (or regimes) that in effect is a dictatorship and seemingly unrepresentative of the Vietnamese people. Thus the same points that we accuse the NLF and North Vietnam of violating are exactly the ones that we and our allies there have and are violating.

I have not up onto this time expressed my opinion to any of our elected representatives mainly because I felt that it would do no good. I must at this time, at least, attempt to clear my own conscience.

Please let me express my support again for your course on the Vietnam question and wish you luck in this course you have elected to follow.

Here is a letter from Chicago, Ill.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Congratulations on your proposed amendments to Senate bills 2791, 2792, and 2793 which would provide that persons drafted into the armed services should not be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without congressional approval. It will certainly let the Senators stand up and be counted and let the people know how their representatives feel about this highly controversial issue of Vietnam, especially the parents of the young men who are being drafted or shortly face the draft. Senator Morse and yourself have the appreciation and gratitude of many thousands who feel their representatives have somehow forgotten or ignored their constituents in this matter.

It is also urged that there be an open and prolonged debate on the floor of the Senate on every single aspect of the crisis in Vietnam, including how we became involved there and whether we have exhausted every single legal avenue in our search for peace.

Again I say, thank God the American people have a few courageous spokesmen who seek a policy that is just.

Here is a letter from Milwaukee, Wis.:
MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is to
express my enthusiasm for your draft legislation concerning making service in Vietnam
voluntary.

I was chief of the communications, media division of the ICA mission in Cambodia for 2½ years, leaving in late 1961. Ten of the people who worked under me in the division were Vietnamese and I went fairly often to Saigon. My opposite number in Saigon was through his duties well acquainted with the internal situation.

Here I have talked recently to young people and church groups in sort of general discussions resembling a little a teach in. There is real doubt regarding the morality of this war. People are not cocksure in either supporting or opposing it but there is a real moral crisis. Young men sincerely hold—some of them—that we are more or less the

It is not a case of they not wanting to sacrifice their lives or health or eyesight or hearing and so on in what they doubt is really a just cause. It is that they do not believe one should kill when one's own country is only in a theoretical and possibly farfetched sense in danger. The history of this war is getting somewhat better known. I think many young men feel as they hear about the history of the war or read about it that they would have had to be fighting against the French if they were Vietnamese. Therefore they feel they would probably continue to fight against the successor to the French if they were Vietnamese.

The moral issue is very serious. We cannot just put it off on the State. We are responsible before God, each of us. To kill in the conviction that it is unjust to do so is murder. Nationality is only an incident in

time in any case. Our moral responsibility is related to things eternal.

In my lifetime, and I am 60, I have never known this Nation to be so sharply and openly divided. I am glad it is divided.

The circumstance is proof that we are not morally bankrupt.

Man does not live by victory alone.

Most sincerely yours,

Here is a letter from Bridgeport, Conn.—they come from all parts of the country:

DEAR SIR: Thank you for upholding the ideals of peace, integrity, good judgment, and democracy. While we are supposedly fighting communism thousands of miles from home our own people are beginning to wonder what has happened to our democratic processes here at home. The American people don't want war but we have it; the American people abhor this war and want a negotiated peace right away but our President speaks out continually for more men to die in Vietnam, for more billions to be delegated to destruction and horror. The American people are being pushed into a war that they do not want, billions of dollars are being spent on war while millions of our own people are in want, thousands upon thousands of young men are being dragged from school to fight a war in which they do not believe. I love America and have always felt proud of my Nation but I am aghast and terrified by the evidence of dictatorial power that seems to be overriding the will and moral questioning of the good people of this country.

Something must be done to turn this tide before the United States involves the entire

world in nuclear destruction.

You and a few other thinking legislators seem to be the only men with courage enough to speak for what is right. Please keep it Peace has to be our only aim if we and world are to survive. Think of what the world are to survive. Think of what could be accomplished in Asia with \$12 billion in food and medical help as opposed to bombs.

I hope you will press for your amendment to forbid sending draftees to South Vietnam against their will. In the light of all the mixed, moral feelings of the people in re-gard to this ill-advised and horrendous mess,

it seems the only just thing to do.

I hope you will press further for a recall of unlimited powers such as President John-son seems to think he should possess. Vietnam could be repeated throughout the world. Dictators have this prerogative; presidents of a democracy should not.

Here is a letter from Power, Mont.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We support, respect, and thank you for the stand you have taken on peace at a time when people are not fully aware of the truth or the consequences. The Senate hearings must go on and must be televised and reported to the American people. The first day the debate on Vietnam in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room was on television we were so glued to our sets that we were unable to do any work except the bare essentials.

We support wholeheartedly your bill to amend the draft law so as to prohibit draftees be sent to Vietnam against their wish unless Congress approves. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Here is a letter from Eugene, Oreg.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have just learned, by mere chance, this morning that you have proposed an amendment or resolution in connection with the military assistance bill that would give draftees the opportunity to volunteer to fight in Vietnam rather than to be sent there under orders. It seems to me to be an inspired way to in-

dicate opposition to the present policy of open-ended escalation of the war in Vietnam, as well as humane.

It is very odd that one has to depend on word of mouth for important news such as this. I have followed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on television almost in their entirety and have paid particular attention to reports on related matters in the press. Not one word have I seen of your proposal with regard to the draft, It is only because, in a reply to a letter to you written by an acquaintance you enclosed a copy of your amendment, and that I chanced to speak to her today, that I learned of it. No doubt you regret even more strongly than we do the seemingly total silence that has greeted your proposal.

My husband and I thank you deeply for this effort, as well as for your many others, to force reassessment of our policy in Vietnam. We have long admired you for your attempts, along with Senator Morse's, to inject reason into our foreign policy. We hope you will continue.

Sincerely yours,

Here is one from New York City:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: While you are not "my" [New York] Senator, your efforts on behalf of peace and rational behavior are really universal.

It is in this context that we write you to thank you and tell you we feel encouraged by leaders of your ilk—attempting to hold the future for us-and our children.

Please accept our warm thanks and appreciation for all that you do on behalf of an adult and mature society.

Cordially,

Here is one from Oakland, Calif .:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: May I compliment you on your suggested amendment to the military pay bill—concerning the assignment of draftees to Vietnam without congressional consent.

According to the newspaper accounts which I found the reasoning which you've advanced is very sound and I hope that others in the Senate will join with you in support of this proposed amendment.

I do hope that we will be hearing more of this amendment and I must tell you that I always find your statements concerning foreign and internal policy extremely incisive and thought provoking. Will continue to look for them with great interest.

Sincerely,

Here is one from neighboring Virginia; McLean, Va.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have read about your proposed bill which would make it necessary for men who have enlisted in the U.S. services to make this their career, or way to earn a living or way of life, to go to Vietnam before sending fresh, new draftees who have no choice but to do as told.

May I say that this makes sense to me, and as a U.S. citizen, I support this bill wholeheartedly, and will write to support such a bill to anyone that you would feel would be of influence in its passage.

Here is one from Seven Valleys, Pa.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to applaud your proposal that only volunteers and not draftees be sent to Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

I am also writing as a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom who attended the legislative seminar this past week and the legislative luncheon Wednesday and greatly appreciated your statements there.

Your record of opposition to this horrifying war is so outstanding that repetitive applause seems redundant, yet I feel it is important that you know that you have the support of many—and I believe of many you have not heard from. I have been doing a considerable amount of traveling by bus lately and wearing peace buttons, find myself conversing with strangers about the war. These conversations seem invariably to be with people who don't write to the Government, but who are extremely distressed at the war and anxious for a rapid peaceful settlement.

I might add that I do what I can to broaden the knowledge of the war of as many people as I can and any reprints of your speeches you could send me would be put to use and greatly appreciated.

In any case, thanks again from a grateful citizen.

Sincerely,

Here is one from Chicago:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to thank you and encourage you in your attempts to bring a little sense into our Vietnam policy. Your bill which prohibits sending unwilling draftees without the approval of Congress into this conflict is an admirable measure.

There are young men who see some point in this war and can risk their lives in it without risking the moral foundations of their lives. There are others, however, who, for very good reasons, are convinced that the campaign in Vietnam is wholly destructive to the Vietnamese people, and therefore unjust and detrimental to our proper goals as a nation. Forcing these young men to die in Vietnam amounts to forcing them to give up the usefulness and meaning of their promising lives, and to see themselves as marked for a stupid, useless, and mean-ingless death. No government should be permitted to do such violence to the moral fiber of those it represents.

Thank you and thank you again, for realizing this, and good luck in your efforts to make others accept it.

Sincerely,

Here is one from Rocky River, Ohio:

DEAR SIR: I hereby wish to express complete approval of your proposal to bar the sending of draftees to southeast Asia without congressional consent.

Respectfully yours,

Here is one from Madison, Wis.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: For the last year or so I have been following your statements about the war in Vietnam and have been very much encouraged by what you have said. Your recent proposal which is coming up before the Senate soon to keep any draftees from being sent to Vietnam without the consent of Congress again gave me hope that perhaps there can be found a peaceful settlement for the war in the immediate future.

I only wish that more Senators and Congressmen for that matter, would have the courage to speak against the policy of our Government in southeast Asia, which can only lead to more bloodshed and to further slighting of much more important world and domestic problems.

Here is one from Denison University, in Granville, Ohio:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: You are to be very highly commended for introducing legislation that would prevent the sending of draftees to Vietnam against their wills without congressional approval. I should also like more generally to commend you for your outspokenness against our country's position in Vietnam

My own position is that our military intervention in the affairs of Vietnam is cruel and totally unjustifiable in moral terms and that we should withdraw our troops and military commitment unilaterally and immediately. I am not for withdrawal in the sense of noncommitment, however, for I believe our country should offer nonmilitary aid to all of Vietnam and to all Vietnamese, whether their allegiance be with Saigon, Hanoi, or the Vietcong.

I'm glad there are people like you in the Senate; I only wish there were more of you. Keep up the good (nonviolent) fight.

Sincerely yours,

Here is one from Tillamook, Oreg.:

My Dear Senator Gruening: I am addressing this letter to you because of the hope you have stirred in my heart when I read in our daily newspaper you would oppose sending our boys to Vietnam as draftees.

There has not been much hope in my heart for a good many months. We mothers of boys endangered by the draft don't really live. We just exist. During the last war my brothers (dedicated, purposeful, scholarly young men) served long and faithfully. I watched my wonderful mother fail before our very eyes as the war years took their toll. I have since then shelved these hellish memories in the deepest, darkest recesses of my mind wishing that such a world of sorrowing could somehow serve some useful purpose. We can't live in the past. But that is exactly what our President and certain others have condemned us to. To broadcast a message of peace and then refuse to discuss peace with the enemy. To send out our boys to fight and die when the President will not meet and amicably discuss peace-able settlement of our problems. We as a nation may be leaders in industry, commerce, or military might but we are not a truly great nation until we clothe ourselves in the raiment of humility and lead all nations in the quest for peace—that priceless goal worthy of all men's hearts.

As a mother and a hardworking officer in the Democratic Party I beg your every effort be directed toward removing ourselves from Vietnam where we stand despised by all our fellowmen. We have erred and greatness lies in how we face our problems now. History will record those who stand steadfast and courageously in the great battle for

God bless you.

Very truly yours,

I think that is a very wonderful letter from a constituent of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], written from the heart.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I did not want to interrupt the Senator from Alaska, but just listen. However, the comment he has made about the letter from a constituent of mine from Tillamook, Oreg., and one from Eugene, Oreg .- and there are many similar letters in my filescause me to take only a moment to tell the Senator and to tell the people of the country, through this RECORD, why I was proud to join in cosponsoring his amendment. Many people do not understand that the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon take the position that a line of demarcation is justifiably drawn between enlisted men and drafted I think it is most unfortunate that we have any enlisted men at all over

there, for reasons I shall set forth in just a moment.

But the Senator from Alaska this morning has made the Record crystal clear. We are drafting men also. Drafted men are not volunteering. These men are being taken in by conscription under a draft law. They are being sent into a war zone where we have no right to be, and never have had any right to be. We are sending boys to their death without a declaration of war in open violation of article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

The Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon have urged that at least sending men to war ought to be regularized. Congress ought to make up its mind whether we are going to declare war or not declare war. The President should make up his mind whether or not he is going to send us a war message, as Woodrow Wilson did on April 2, 1917, when he sent one to a joint session of Congress recommending war against Germany. At the beginning of the message Woodrow Wilson said he was without constitutional authority to make war in the absence of a declaration of war.

This is an elementary principle of constitutional law.

Then, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, following Pearl Harbor, sent Congress a war message asking for a declaration of war.

That is the position of the senior Senator from Oregon, and I know it is the position of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who really has been my leader and teacher in this historic debate that has been going on now well over 2 years. He and I, now joined by a few others, have stood on this floor week after week and protested the course of action that our Government is following in American foreign policy.

We are saying by this amendment: If you are going to draft these boys and send them into war, then declare war. I believe the American people are entitled to have this administration take that course of action.

But, then, I point out also that this war has greatly divided this country, in spite of the apologists for this administration in and out of the Senate. This war is causing a great rift among our people at the grassroots of America.

I wish to say again to my President, as I have said so many times, I love him, but I love my country more.

In my judgment, my President needs to clarify this situation by making perfectly clear to our country what his objectives are. He completely failed to make those objectives clear in New York City last night. He spoke in terms of semantic emotional sanctions but not in terms of specific proposals for ending the war

As I will say tomorrow when I make my speech in opposition to the pending legislation, the very terms of the pending bill authorizes an escalated war. The American people need to be told that the administration has in that bill—but they are not boasting or talking about it—the funds for escalating the war at any time the President decides to escalate it. I

do not propose to vote to give my President that power.

In my judgment, that kind of arbitrary discretion should not be vested in any President at any time.

Then, what needs to be asked, of course, in talking about supporting a government in South Vietnam, is how did it happen that we decided to support a puppet government in South Vietnam? The government that we, the United States, created in open opposition and in violation of the Geneva accords of 1954 is the government which we seek to entrench in South Vietnam. We did not have the slightest right to set up a puppet government in South Vietnam and we now say to the world that we are going to support that government.

South Vietnam does not belong to the United States. South Vietnam does not belong to this little puppet that we are supporting by the name of Ky, either. South Vietnam and North Vietnam belong to all of the Vietnamese people both north and south.

Do not forget that the Geneva accords proposed that there be a 2-year period after the line of military demarcation was drawn separating the military forces of Vietminh and the military forces of the French in bringing about a reunification of Vietnam both north and

south into one country.

They were to take 2 years to work out a program for reunifying Vietnam. That is what was provided. Who stopped it? The United States. That is going to be the sad, sordid, black record of history that will be written against our country for future generations of American boys and girls to see.

The amendment of the Senator from Alaska goes to the very core of this matter. It goes to the issue and the right of our country to be there in the first place. We had no right. If we had none in the first place, we have none now. What are we going to do? Are we going to support this regime in South Vietnam and impose this regime on North Vietnam? Do the American people know the plan is for the Ky regime to take over all of Vietnam?

We are headed for one of the bloodiest holocausts in the history of mankind if other nations of the world do not stop the United States.

It makes me unhappy to have to say this.

The fact is that every noncombatant nation of the world that is a member of the United Nations has a great and historic obligation to say to the United States, "Stop your war, for you are endangering the world."

The course of action that we are following in Vietnam makes our country the most dangerous threat to the peace of the world existing on the globe. We are following a completely improper course of action.

It is a sad thing that the other signatories to the United Nations are not following their commitment and obligation. What is needed is for them to stop talking behind the scenes in New York City and get the issue into the open before the Security Council and make up their

minds whether they are going to assume their peacekeeping functions. If not, we should go to the General Assembly, where I am satisfied that 80 nations would proceed if it is put to them to do the peacekeeping.

What is needed is that the other nations of the world send whatever number of divisions of men are necessary to separate the United States and South Vietnam on the one side and North Vietnam and the Vietcong on the other.

South Vietnam should be turned into a checkerboard of buffer zones, with division after division of men from noncombatant nations being sent in, not to keep the war going, but to stop the fighting and to enforce a cease-fire imposed on the United States and the Vietcong.

Let me say to the world, "If you wish to avoid the great danger of an Asian holocaust you must make clear to my country that it must obey a cease-fire to be imposed upon us by the noncombatant nations of the world, in keeping with the provisions of the United Nations Charter."

It may not work, but we better try; because one thing is certain if we follow our present course of action we will end up in a massive war in Asia. Yes, I listened to the Vice President this morning. I do not share the views of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] at all. I listened to the Vice President. In my opinion he has lost all of his persuasive influence among thinking people who are willing to think about the great obligations of war and peace.

I never expected to hear my Vice President make this plea for war that he is making. Do not be fooled by his semantics. If we follow the course of action of the President of the United States and the Vice President as he is talking these hours, we are on the way to a major war in Asia.

That is why we say, in submitting the amendment, that we believe we had better come to grips with the question as to whether we shall send conscripted American boys to die in a war that has not been officially declared.

I well know that the speech I have just made, as well as others I have made, will bring down upon my head strong castigations and charges of disloyalty. In fact, last Sunday I was supposed to be boycotted by the American Legion at a speech I made at Harrisburg, Pa. Yet American legionnaire after legionnaire came to compliment me. One of them, introducing me to his 12-year-old and 14-year-old boys, said that when he heard on the radio that the American Legion was asking its members to boycott my speech, he drove 100 miles to be there, because, as he said:

They are not going to tell me in free America—and we hope it will remain free—whom I can hear and whom I can't hear.

Of course, the attempted boycott by the American Legion provided me with an audience much larger than I otherwise would have had, because at the grassroots of America the people are concerned about what is happening in Vietnam.

Last Saturday afternoon, at 1 o'clock, I spoke at a high school in Madison, Wis.

The sponsors of the meeting said that more than 3,600 persons were in attendance and that it was necessary to use closed television circuits to enable the overflow audiences that could not enter the auditorium to hear my speech.

Yes, Mr. President, at the grassroots of America the people are disturbed because they know we are not marching down the road to peace but are marching down the road toward more war.

The Senate has before it a bill which some of our colleagues say involves no question of policy. They say it concerns merely the question whether we shall provide materiel for the boys in Vietnam. But I say again, as I said yesterday, that the boys are not suffering from a lack of materiel over there. That was admitted again this morning by spokesmen for the administration. There is not one of us who would want to deny a single bullet or a single safeguard that a single boy needs, because they are not in Vietnam because they wanted to go there, but because their Government sent them there.

In these historic hours of this debate, we ought to take a look at the policy that is involved in the bill. The bill contains a bad policy, a policy that permits the carrying on of a greatly enlarged war if the President decides to enlarge it. I do not believe our country should risk that exercise of arbitrary discretion. The people of the country are entitled to know whether we are going to war under article I, section 8, or not.

So again I ask my President: "Why don't you send up a war message, and then ask Congress to decide whether it wants to declare war?" Such a proposal would arouse a public debate that is sorely needed in this country at every community level.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I continue to read from this outpouring of expression from the American people. I read a letter from historic Charlottes-ville, Va.:

Dear Senator Gruening: Congratulations on your continued, articulate opposition to our "holy war" in Vletnam. Like the holy wars of history, barbarity of indescribable dimension accompanies its execution. Unlike those wars, its continued execution threatens the security of the entire world. It also creates the most brutal selection of national priorities. Nothing can be more important to the crusader that the growing ability to slaughter the Asians—to divert public moneys from the feeding of the starving, the medication of the dying, the protection of the oppressed—to the ever more relentless and ruthless destruction and violation of life and property in a most indiscriminate manner.

I applaud your amendment to the war bill to make the assignment of inductees to Vietnam subject to congressional approval a matter of option. I wish you every success in that matter.

Please exert your influence to bring Secretary of War Dean Rusk—

The writer has slightly confused the Secretary's title—

back to reality from the schizophrenically, moralistic hallucination which he takes to be the real world. In my own view, he is the most dangerous man to the progress of peace in the entire world. He appears determined to have his "war of attrition" with China

which he so woodenly advocated when he sided with MacArthur in 1951.

Please continue to voice your opposition to the war.

Sincerely yours,

I read next from a letter I received from a minister in Mound City, Ill.:

My Dear Sir: The Globe-Democrat says that you are back of a resolution that would give those who are to go to Vietnam, the right to express their opinions on this matter.

As I see it the overwhelming majority of the people who have not expressed themselves in public demonstrations, are a long way from being satisfied with our entanglement in Vietnam, that according to figures has already cost 1,700 of the promising blood of America.

If we are so much concerned with the freedom of people from Communist aggression, why did we turn a deaf ear to Cuba, when Castro took over lock, stock, and barrel?

Recalling past history, I am convinced that the time has come for the young men to have something to say about their destiny. Their's has been too long, "to do and die, and not to ask why." I am with you in your efforts.

I am,

Very truly yours,

The next letter is from Kirkwood, Mo.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for all of your good work on the conflict in Vietnam, and for your forthcoming resolution with respect to draftees in that connection. We shall be watching the outcome of the debate with interest.

I read next a letter from Kirkland, Wash.:

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

Sir: Thank you with all my heart for introducing the bill against requiring draftees to fight in Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

I am a longtime admirer of your courageous stand against our policy in Vietnam.

I feel that draftees should not be required to fight in Vietnam. Many are as against what we are doing there as are those who have been classified conscientious objectors. One's conscience may allow him to fight in a defensive war but not in this situation where innocent men, women, and children are being killed. I cannot believe that our men are defending our country when it has not been attacked. Young men, whose parents never thought we would fight an aggressive war, were taught to value human life, and now they must go against their consciences.

Aside from objecting on moral grounds, they may also feel, as I do, that what we are doing in Vietnam is harmful to our country, that we are precipitating a world nuclear war that could devastate our country as well as most of the world.

The only hope I see for our country, and the world, is in you and the other few leaders who have the insight and courage to speak out for the right on this issue. We ordinary people are not being heard. Many are afraid to speak out because they are so misunderstood, called traitors or draft dodgers. The issue doesn't come to us to vote on. We thought we were voting against escalation when we voted against Senator Goldwater, only to learn now that President Johnson was planning similar escalation when he was campaigning, but didn't say so, so we really had no choice.

Respectfully and gratefully yours,

The next letter I shall read is from Bellingham, Wash.:

Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

Washington, D.C.
DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: It is noted that you have introduced legislation to prohibit this Government from committing draftees to the Vietnam situation without the consent of Congress. Once again, I wish to express my personal gratitude to you for your efforts to turn the tide from control of the "war at whim" people.

It is inconceivable to me that the sort of

thinking which drives us into such errors as Vietnam can have any ultimate effect other than to alienate decent people and drive them to the very extreme which we assert we are fighting to avoid. Overtaxation, degradation, and conscription of their chil-dren finally drove the Chinese to communism; the result will be the same here if our 'leadership" refuses to come to terms with human decency.

Very truly yours,

The next letter, from Philadelphia, Pa., reads:

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING, Senate Office Building,

Washington, D.C.
DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Our morning paper carries word of your having proposed legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam until Congress authorizes such assign-

Short of a declaration of peace, this is the best news the concerned, thinking Americans could hope for. It is only regrettable that delaying tactics of the Administration held off the move for so long.

My husband joins me in extending congratulations to you on your wise and coura-geous move. May the bill very speedily become law.

Sincerely yours,

Here is a letter from Brooklyn, N.Y. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Too frequently I find myself writing to Government officials and Members of Congress because I disagree with them, and much too rarely do I take time out these busy days to thank them for something well said or done. Let me at least partly correct this for myself by thanking you for the foresight, statesmanship, and the courage you have shown as one of the lonely voices opposed to the madness that is taking place in Vietnam, and even more particularly for your recent proposal not to permit draftees to be sent to Vietnam unless this is their choice and Congress so votes.

Thank you for your wisdom and your courage.

Here is a letter from Bellingham, Wash. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I was most pleased to read in tonight's Bellingham Herald the AP report of the amendments that you and Senator Morse have offered to the administration's defense appropriation bill. The prohibition of involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam will, I hope, receive the support that it deserves. I respect you for continuing your efforts in behalf of an unpopular cause. Sincerely.

Here is a letter from Berkeley, Calif. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: My entire family (two sons of voting age, two daughters almost voting age, my wife and myself) all strongly admire your brave and intelligent stand on the Vietnam issues. We have read from time to time the newspaper reports of your statements in Congress and just today the San Francisco Chronicle carried another story about the amendment you have proposed to the defense supplement bill for Vietnam. Please keep up your efforts in the name of sanity and morality.

The whole Nation owes you a debt of gratitude for your brave stand on Vietnam. I am sure that the war hawks are putting all sorts of pressure on the President and on the few brave Senators who speak out against intensification of the war. But I am equally sure that there are millions upon millions of us who ardently pray for a peaceful solution to this seemingly impossible situation, and we all are grateful to you, Senator GRUEN-

I have thought that one possible solution would be to announce to the whole world and to the United Nations that we would accept any solution worked out by an impartial United Nations commission, with no strings or preconditions whatever. I believe this is the only way out for several reasons. One, the Vietcong and North Vietnamese could hardly refuse such an offer, and I am sure that world opinion would support such a move (while almost no opinion in other countries supports our present position). Second, I believe that no matter how or what the U.N. commission decided the issues, nothing-no matter what-would be so bad for us and the world as to continue to escalate the war. Any decision, however bad, would be less bad than a world war.

Again, may I tell you that you have our heartfelt admiration and highest esteem.

Here is a letter from Clovis, Calif. It

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We were very pleased to hear of the amendment you wish to offer that would prohibit sending draftees to Vietnam without prior consent of Congress. We wish you every success in getting it passed.

We also hope you are able to stage public hearings on U.S. policy in Vietnam. very glad, and heartened, to read of your attitudes on Vietnam, as we have been very distressed concerning this issue, and sincerely hope somehow it can begin to be righted.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Freeport, N.Y. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: What a wonderful world this would be if there were more Senator GRUENINGS. You have my unbounded admiration and every time I read of your views in the newspapers my faith in human nature is restored.

Your solution to the draft problem regard-Vietnam is something long overdue. Our neighbor Canada is a good example for us-Canadians can be drafted to protect the country if it is attacked but cannot be sent overseas. When you are asked to kill, this seems the solution to the problem—one shouldn't be made to kill against his beliefs.

Keep up your great work.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Danville, Pa. It reads:

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I saw in today's paper—the Philadelphia Inquirer you introduced legislation that the draftees should not be forced into going into Vietnam without the approval of Congress.

Please, please do everything in your power to bring it about. You will gain the un-dying gratitude of thousands of American parents if you do. Many sleepless nights are spent worrying about this very thing. These

young boys are forced into the service and after only 8 to 12 weeks of training they are sent into the jungles and swamps of Vietnam and expected to defend themselves. This is inhuman and very unfair.

The older and more experienced men hold down the jobs back of the fighting areas.

I have a young son who will soon be called up for service (drafted) and it almost drives me out of my mind thinking he may be sent to Vietnam with so little preparation.

It seems to me the draftees are being

penalized for not volunteering for the service, just as all the men in our country who do not go to college are penalized.

So please do whatever you can to help us in this matter.

Thank you.

Here is a letter from Bridgewater, Conn. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: For the first time in my life I wished I lived in Alaska, so that I could be one of your constituents. Your proposal that only draftees who wish to serve in Vietnam be sent there, is the most sensible thing I have heard yet in connection with this war-if this war is to go on.

I do not believe in this undeclared war. think it is pointless, horrible and tragic. Yet if some wish to fight it let those be the ones to do it.

Blessings and luck in your amendment to the supplemental defense appropriation bill.

I have a telegram from Lothar Stewart, of Moorhead, Minn. It reads as follows:

MOORHEAD, MINN.,

January 26, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Washington, D.C.:

Support proposed draftee amendments to pending Vietnam defense bill. Urge immediate end to involvement.

I have a letter from Baraboo, Wis. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR: May we commend you for your honest remarks concerning the voluntary service in the phony war in Viet-nam. If we could get legislation passed to do that as well as conscript wealth and war profits, perhaps the military couldn't have the power it does and we could use the vast sums to make living better for some of our unfortunate citizens. We have watched your voting record and work in Washington and would we have more statesmen like you.

These are merely a few of the hundreds of letters which I have received. However, these letters illustrate the deep and heartfelt concern and worry among the American people. I believe that if their message or their pleas could be presented to our colleagues we would have an affirmative vote in favor of the amendment.

There are many other communications that I could read. However, I shall read only a few more of these letters.

It is rather striking—and this cannot be emphasized too strongly-that we are sending these young men to Vietnam and taking them away from their families while a South Vietnamese force equivalent to virtually one-half of the total U.S. force of 200,000 that we have sent there-96,000 of the South Vietnamese soldiers—has deserted in the past Yet we are sending our young boys to die and to take the place of those men who will not fight for their own country.

That to me is one of the most disgraceful situations imaginable. It should be unthinkable that in this body and elsewhere our colleagues will support the sending of our young men to die in a foreign land whose people will not fight for themselves. The evidence of this appears in today's New York Times in a story describing how there have been 96,000 desertions this year. Yet we have been hearing all the official propaganda that with our growing troop involvement the morale of the South Vietnamese has yastly improved.

The evidence is overwhelming that we have gradually had to take over the entire conduct of this war. The situation has changed greatly since the time when President Kennedy, a few weeks before his death, said that:

This is their war. We can give them assistance, but they are the ones who have got to fight. They are the ones who have got to win it.

Since that time it has become evident that there is little will on the part of our South Vietnamese so-called "allies" to fight this war, certainly not among the leaders, the corrupt grafters whom we support.

The evidence of corruption which confirms what has long been known, is contained in an article from today's Washington Post which I am having printed in today's RECORD. The article describes how the entire government is corrupt. It indicates that one of the biggest jokes in South Vietnam is that we are telling the corruptors and grafters in charge to stop corruption. That must be one of the biggest laughs they have. We would all be laughing if it were not so tragic. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Stanley Karnow in today's Washington Post entitled "'Mr. Nguyer,' Saigon Employee, Chuckles Over Curbs on Graft" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Mr. Nguyen," Saigon Employee, Chuckles Over Curbs on Graft

(By Stanley Karnow)

Saigon, February 23.—The official announcement here yesterday that the South Vietnamese Government is creating a special court to try profiteers and grafters drew a chuckle from Mr. Nguyen.

"If that court does its job properly," he observed, "it will have to put almost the entire administration behind bars."

Mr. Nguyen, whose real name cannot be revealed, would know. He is deputy director of a key Saigon ministry that deals with the personnel problems of South Vietnam's 120,000 civil servants. By his own admission, Mr. Nguyen himself is up to his elbows in influence peddling, bribery and several less larcenous forms of moneymaking. Nguyen believes that nearly every other state employee must be so engaged, too.

Profitable sideline activities are so widespread, in Mr. Nguyen's view, that most Vietnamese civil servants can find little time to handle their regular functions. This partly explains why many American officials here, designated to work with the local administration, lead lives of quiet desperation.

It is not uncommon for a Vietnamese clerk to devote 3 or 4 hours a day to his Government job, then spend the rest of his time selling favors, speculating on imported commodities or arranging real estate deals. Mr. Nguyen, a true patriot, puts in a full official day and does his trafficking in the evening.

In large measure, this semblance of corruption stems from the fact that Vietnam is Asia, where public office has been traditionally used for private gain. More important, however, is the fact that the average civil servant here must resort to some kind of illegal operation if he wants to avoid starvation.

Except for an insignificant raise 2 years ago, civil service salaries have not changed since 1954, when South Vietnam attained its independence. In contrast, prices have spiraled astronomically over the past decade.

Thus a Government stenographer earns the equivalent of about \$20 a month—roughly what a couple of Americans here spend on an ordinary dinner. Mr. Nguyen, whose official walls are covered with diplomas from French universities, makes \$100 a month, the third highest salary in his ministry. He receives an additional \$18 a month in special allocations.

To make ends meet, state employees indulge in various tricks. Those of a higher order can obtain privileged purchasing rights permitting them to buy wholesale quantities of merchandise for resale.

Contractors often find civil servants handy and willing intermediaries for sealing deals with the Government, and they pay tidy commissions for the service. Manufacturers frequently offer certain Government employees lucrative opportunities to win their sympathy for the future. A current offer in one ministry is 2,500 sacks of cement, which can be turned over at a 35-percent profit.

Lowlier civil servants must rely on more pedestrian techniques. Internal revenue department employees speed up the delivery of tax clearances for an additional 200 piasters, and exit visas can be processed quickly for an extra 1,000 piasters. Office boys and other menials simply swipe Government pencils and stationery for sale on the black market.

For Mr. Nguyen, making ends meet is considerably more complex. In line with his upper bourgeois standing, he supports four childen in private schools, occasionally endows his wife with jewelry, and wears a clean white shirt every day. His expenses run to the equivalent of \$350 a month, or more than triple his official salary.

One of his most successful sources of income is the used car trade. He buys automobiles from departing Americans and sells them to wealthy Vietnamese, and he can gross from 50- to 100-percent profit on each transaction.

This business tangentially leads Mr. Nguyen into somewhat shadier realms. To pay the Americans with meaningful money he must find dollars, which gets him into black market currency deals. Moreover, he has to legalize the sales of automobiles from foreigners to Vietnamese, which entails greasing the palms of customs officials.

From time to time, Mr. Nguyen has to repair or refurbish his used cars with rare spare parts, available only through smugglers. And while he is at it, he may, on an ad hoc basis, handle whatever other contraband items that promise to yield a fast piaster.

His commercial acumen is such that, just moonlighting, Mr. Nguyen may well be quadrupling or quintupling his wage as a civil servant. He has pondered the possibility of quitting his Government job to engage in the used car trade full time.

His Government position is a good fulcrum from which to operate commercially, how-

ever. So Mr. Nguyen is sticking to it. "Besides," he will insist, "I want to do something for my country."

Mr. GRUENING. I read further, here is a letter from Urbana, Ill. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Our evening paper reports that you and Senator Morse have introduced an amendment to the military appropriation bill prohibiting the drafting of men for service in Vietnam without the approval of Congress.

Thank you for that. Although I am far past the draft age, and am not myself affected by the bill, I feel it is morally reprehensible for a country to draft men to fight in a war that they believe is morally wrong, as is true of many men of draft age.

I hope that you feel free now to renew your opposition to the war in Vietnam. Opposition to the war is greatest among persons who know most about the situation.

Very gratefully yours,

Here is a letter from Los Angeles, Calif. It reads:

Dear Senator: While I am not one of your constituents, I do wish to congratulate you on your amendments designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam without the consent of Congress. Even if my own son were not being drafted next Tuesday, I would commend you for your stand, as I consider the involvement of the United States of America in Vietnam a disaster, stemming from a series of serious mistakes on the parts of all our Presidents since Roosevelt. While I do not blame President Johnson for the war, I do consider him responsible for the decision to bomb North Vietnam.

This mistake has apparently brought about the increased involvement of North Vietnam, increased determination of the majority of the Vietnamese people to rid their soil of the white man, increased dislike and distrust of us on the part of all the other nations of the world, Communist and non-Communist. I see our present path in Asia as national suicide.

I urge you to do all you possibly can to persuade the President and Congress to continue the efforts toward peaceful negotiations, even if they do not bear immediate fruit, and to bend all efforts toward convincing Ho Chi Minh of our sincerity in willingness to return to the Geneva accords of 1954.

I also urge you to use your power to strengthen the United Nations so that it may shoulder the responsibilities which only a world organization can carry out—maintaining peace and settling disputes among nations, large and small.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Arlington, Va., just across the Potomac River. It reads: Hon. Ernest Gruening,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.
My DEAR SENAT

My Dear Senator Gruening: I read yesterday evening in the Star of the excellent proposal by you and Senator Morse to make service in Vietnam by our boys voluntary and not compulsory. This is a fine and long-needed move. As of now, our sons, husbands, nephews, and others, are willy-nilly sent to the Vietnam blood bath.

It is unthinkable really, that our foreign policy in its essence means the lives of our finest young men. Also, strange is the policy that our youths must police and protect nations and peoples all over the world.

It is a pity that our citizens are not more articulate in protest against all this.

You might be interested to know what the voters are saying about the war in many sections of the country.

Here is a letter from Bridgeville, Pa. It reads:

BRIDGEVILLE, PA.

Senator Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senate,

Dear Sir: Keep up your good work against this unnecessary involvement in Vietnam and your proposal against involuntary service for draftees without congressional approval.

Sincerely.

Here is a letter from Morehead, Minn. It reads:

Dear Senator Gruening: You seem to be one of the few Senators who has the courage to disagree with the President. Congratulations. Your proposal that draftees should not fight in Vietnam without the consent of Congress gets my wholehearted support, and I urge you to propose a few more things, such as bringing this problem to the United Nations for solution, and calling for a complete congressional investigation into our involvement in this war, the uses to which our foreign aid in South Vietnam has been put, the bombing of the villagers and peasants about whose right to vote we are so concerned, and many other matters about which there have been rumors and conjectures. Perhaps if enough Senators chorus together, they can be heard above the booming of the generals. Thank you.

Here is one from El Cerrito, Calif .:

I heartily commend you in your consistent opposition to the Vietnamese undeclared war. I consider it highly immoral in that we have broken the Geneva agreements about free elections and foreign soldiers in Vietnam while Johnson and the State Department lay unctuously the blame on North Vietnam for breaking the agreements. These are real totalitarian techniques, I feel.

I heartily concur in your proposal that no draftee should be sent to Vietnam without

the consent of Congress.

Here is one from Hoodsport, Wash.:

We wish to express our agreement and support of your legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

In addition, we wish to protest the excesses of pettiness and arbitrariness practiced by the Selective Service. An illustration of this is contained in the enclosed newspaper clipping.

It is our hope that current Selective Service procedures will be subjected to investi-

gation and reform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the contents of the clipping enclosed with that letter, entitled "Father Drafted Hours After Physical for Failing to Report New Address," be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

FATHER DRAFTED HOURS AFTER PHYSICAL FOR FAILING TO REPORT NEW ADDRESS

A 25-year-old Madras man, married, and father of four children, was drafted into the Marines Wednesday, after failing to report change of address to the Selective Service. He was inducted and flown to San Diego within 24 hours of taking his Marine Corps physical.

wherein their is only a store distinct away.
Yet the Corted Street into actorists dispose-

Robert W. Swan said after his induction that he first registered for the draft 7 years ago in Milwaukee, while he was living in Gladstone. He got married the following year, and didn't hear from the draft board again until last November.

Meanwhile, he had moved from Gladstone to two different residences in Portland, then to Madras. He reported the Portland address to the draft board, but he told the Oregonian he forgot to report the second Portland address and Madras address.

In November, Swan got a letter asking him to take a physical from his family doctor and send the results promptly to the draft board.

Because the letter was delayed in being forwarded from Swan's old address in Portland to his current one in Madras, he was unable to report the results of the physical on time. This is how the draft board learned Swan had been delinquent in reporting his changes of address, Swan said.

In January, the draft board sent him another order to take a physical—but this time, at the induction center on Southwest Taylor Street. Swan took the physical Wednesday, passed it, and found himself inducted into the Marine Corps in a matter of hours.

He left Portland Airport for San Diego at midnight, less than 24 hours after passing the physical. He left behind his wife Norma and four children, who will receive a \$145-a-month family allowance from the Marine Corps.

The Selective Service headquarters said that any delinquent registrant may be processed for induction despite his family status.

Mr. GRUENING. Here is one from Chicago:

I am writing to commend you for your strong opposition to President Johnson's war policy in Vietnam. I was glad to read of your proposed bill that would prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to serve in Vietnam without congressional approval.

I see that President Johnson is contending that the resolution passed by Congress in August, 1964, gives him authority to take whatever action he may choose in Vietnam. It seems to me that the time has come for Congress to reconsider this resolution. I know you voted against it at the time it was passed. I understand Senator Morse is introducing a resolution to rescind this resolution. I am sure you will give it your support.

Here is another one from Los Angeles: According to a report in today's issue of the Los Angeles Times you are introducing legislation to prohibit the Armed Forces from assigning draftees to Vietnam against their

I wish to congratulate you on this measure. It is a step in the right direction.

Having lived for nearly 8 years in the Far East, I greatly deplore Mr. Johnson's Vietnam policy. In fact, I consider it the greatest disaster for our beloved country.

May your efforts be successful.

Mr. President, I think these letters—a small sampling—demonstrate that the concern of the American people is deep-seated and overwhelming; and I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of these letters be printed in the Record following the others I have read.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how many letters does the Senator wish to put in the RECORD?

Mr. GRUENING. I should say there are about 25 more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENTFIELD, CALIF., January 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We are very much in favor of your legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam without the approval of Congress. Also not to resume bombing North Vietnam. Better yet get out of Vietnam.

Thank you.

SELAH, WASH., January 27, 1966.

Senator Ernest Gruening, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wish to commend you for your action in offering the amendments to prevent young American men being drafted and sent to fight in Vietnam unless Congress affirms. It is good to know that there are still men who are not afraid to stand up and be counted, when they feel the country is being led down the wrong path.

I feel that our entry into the Vietnam situation was poorly justified, and wonder if we may not yet discover that the same Vietcong we are trying to drum up such a hatred for, will not turn out to be the true patriots of their country. These are the same people who fought for their freedom from an admittedly short-sighted colonialist government.

Why are we in Vietnam? Is it to protect a notoriously graft-ridden government that we are risking the very finest our country has produced? I pray that this is not the case, and that if we are wrong, we have leaders strong enough to admit it, and soon.

I am the mother of four sons, and have watched fearfully as our asinine foreign policy has been allowed, like Topsy, to "just grow."

I pray for your continued courage and wisdom.

Sincerely,

Senator Ennest Gruening,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to express my deep and sincere appreciation for the legislation which you have introduced to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in Vietnam. I am sure there are millions of real Americans who agree with you even though you may not hear from them.

Something must be done to bring this war to an early end. The life of one of our fine young men is worth more than the entire enemy. Our leaders should take a lesson from the policies of nations such as Sweden (no war since 1814) and Switzerland. We are taking in Cuban refugees. Why not

We are taking in Cuban refugees. Why not move the friendly Vietnamese to other lands where they would be safe. Surely there are countries that would willingly absorb these people, including our own United States. The cost hardly could be as great as the billions now being wasted in carrying on this present conflict. And, precious lives would be saved. I assume that our objective is to protect the inhabitants (not the land) from the Communist enemy.

Sincerely yours,

SEAL BEACH, CALIF.

P.S.—I am 79, have lived through three terrible wars. I am opposed to war except in defense of our country.

ITHACA, N.Y.

Senator ERNEST E. GRUENING, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C .:

Strongly support your amendment whereby draftees not be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without congressional approval.

CITRUS HEIGHTS, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

DEAR SIR: I have just read in the newspaper that you introduced legislation today to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam. That makes me very, very happy. I cannot be-lieve that our President legally has the right to send our men to another country to kill and be killed where there is no formal declaration of war. The President says we are fighting for freedom and our way of life. What freedom do our men have when they are forced to leave their wives and homes, forced into Army camps, then taken, against their will, to another country to be mistreated, and suffer, then perhaps killed? Where is there any freedom in that?

Right now I am not too proud of being an

American citizen.

Please, please, do what you can to stop this sending our men to Vietnam. I am just a poor working mother but please tell me what I can do to help you.

Sincerely,

CHICAGO, ILL.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRUENING: We wish to commend you for introducing amendments to Senate bills 2791, 2792, 2793, bills now under consideration by the Senate Committee on the Armed Services and Foreign Relations, bills that would authorize additional military

and AID programs for Vietnam.

For a long time you have shown much courage and a high sense of responsibility in your opposition to the undeclared war we

are fighting in Vietnam.

For much too long our young men have been sent to Vietnam, by three presidents, for reasons that are highly ambiguous and whose legal right to do so is suspect.

When you do introduce your amendments we hope there are enough men in the Senate who will "stand up and be counted."

Sincerely,

Hon. Senator ERNEST GRUENING:

I read an article in the January 26 Daily News of your proposal to forbid sending draftees to Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

I am definitely in favor of this prosposal and I hope it will be passed.

Yours sincerely.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

DECATUR, GA., January 31, 1966.

DEAR MR. GRUENING: Let me thank you for proposing legislation for not sending draftees into southeast Asia. I thoroughly agree with your ideas as expressed in the January 26th CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like very much to see the draft replaced by alternative service, Peace Corps work, or meaningful employment. Too many of our youth lose hope and desire to make of themselves anything worthwhile as they are pressured by so many people to go into military service. It seems to me an exploitation of youth and military conscription is for Communist countries, not a democracy. Has there been any desire for this kind of legislation by any individuals or groups?

I am very proud there are men like you and Mr. Morse in Washington. It is too bad that there are not more who are as strong and morally right.

Sincerely,

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We read of your proposed amendments to pending bills for additional appropriations for the war in Vietnam, to wit; that military service in Vietnam be on a voluntary basis, and we wish to express our full agreement with the proposed amendments.

We have written to our Congressman and to our Senator requesting them to give all possible support to these amendments.

We further wish to thank you for the good fight you are making to bring this illegal, immoral, and brutal war to an end. It has disgraced and dishonored our country long enough.

Respectfully,

DAVENPORT, WASH.

Senator Ernest Gruening,

Washington, D.C.
DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your decision to sponsor a bill to prohibit sending draftees to Vietnam.

I hope that such courageous action by responsible leaders, such as yourself, will give our Government cause to reexamine our policy in that area.

Sincerely,

Senator ERNEST GRUENING. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: It was good to learn that the President gave you permission to do as you thought best in 1966 in regard to making suggestions for the conduct of the Vietnamese war. As of now it seems inconceivable that he thought the war would be over by last December.

Your suggestion of not sending into jungle warfare the recent draftees (many of them very young) seems to me very sensible, not to say humane. Lacking training and experience, they could most quickly become casualties.

To my mind, our deep involvement in southeast Asia is deplorable—and very difficult to improve.

Respectfully yours,

Senator GRUENING.

DEAR SIR: You have my warm approval for your proposal to cease sending of draftees to Vietnam. It looks like you men in Congress are the only ones capable of exercising the restraint we so vitally need in this dangerous situation.

Sincerely.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

TUCSON, ARIZ.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We wish to assure you of our support for your bill which would prohibit the drafting of young men for the war in Vietnam.

We hope there is a feeling strong enough in the Senate to pass the bill recently introduced by Senator Morse, to take back the power which was given to the President to prosecute this war. It is our feeling that the Congress did not have the constitutional right to abrogate its own power to declare

We are certain that unless President Johnson's powers are curtailed he will push us

further and further toward a nuclear holocaust.

Sincerely yours, ·加工一个全分也是 第56

MADISON, WIS.

Hon. Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I read with interest of your proposed bill to bar the Armed Forces from sending draftees to Vietnam without their consent unless Congress so orders. To force a man to fight a war which he believes is wrong is even more immoral than war itself. I support such a bill unequivocally.

As I write this the President has so far resisted the pressures to resume the bomb-ing of North Vietnam. For the sake of the slim hopes which remain for peace, I hope he will continue to do so. I simply cannot understand how supposedly responsible pub-lic figures can advocate renewed bombing as the means to a cheap victory. It did not work in Korea, and it will not work in Vietnam. It will only unite the North Vietnamese in their determination to drive what they believe-rightly or wrongly-to be the foreign aggressors out of Vietnam, and will further dissipate what little the United States has retained of the world's respect.

I admire the courage and determination of the Senators and Congressmen such as yourself and Senators Morse and Fulbright who are resisting the current war hysteria to oppose our unrealistic and ultimately self-defeating Vietnam policy. Please continue to represent all the people, from all over the country, who, like myself, oppose what our country—despite our claims of defend-ing freedom—is actually doing in Vietnam.

Yours very sincerely,

AMERICA—LAND OF THE FREE?

Hon. Ernest Gruening,

U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Your Senate speech, moving to keep draftees out of Vietnam, was summarized in the Chicago newspapers a few days ago.

While I have been a Republican for many years, I regret that I am not one of your constituents so I could vote for you. Being so logical on this point must mean that you also use sound commonsense on other Senate matters.

To me it is ironical that America, which is supposed to be the land of freedom, arbitrarily takes such freedom away from our young men, without recourse, and forces them (in some respects no different from a Russian slave labor camp) to fight 9,000 miles away with no hope for any permanent success

I have in mind the case of a son of one of my neighbors—a Catholic family. The young man spent 2 years studying to enter the priesthood. When he decided not to continue, he was drafted last July and is now on his way to Vietnam. Here is just one instance of a boy of high character who, against his will and natural instincts, is being forced into the position of killing other humans whom he will never know. And may in turn sacrifice his life to no good purpose. The tragedy is that even though he makes the supreme sacrifice it is highly debatable whether he is actually defending America in Vietnam.

Our State Department and other do-gooders start out with the highly questionable premise that our national security is imperiled if Vietnam and all of southeast Asia goes communistic. Highly questionable be-cause such countries are 9,000 miles away, whereas Cuba is only a short distance away. Yet the United States isn't seriously imperiled even though Cuba now is communistic. A nuisance but not a deadly threat.

It is said we are merely fulfilling our obligations as a member of SEATO. But where are all of the other SEATO countries who should be vitally interested if there is any real merit in our being in Vietnam? Aside from token forces from Australia, the Philippines, and Korea, the SEATO countries are not there. Primarily because they are oriental and don't care whether our boys live or die. In other words, fight to the last Ameri-The Buddhists and the rest of the people won't work together for a stable gov-ernment in Vietnam. The oppression of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem and the subsequent murders are incontrovertible evidence. So maybe a lot of their people don't care who rules their country.

Personally, I am of the firm opinion that all of southeast Asia could go communistic, and our national interests, if we stay clear, will be benefited rather than impaired. As someone recently wrote—socialism (i.e., com-munism) and famine go hand in hand. Recently U.S. News & World Report pointed out that in 1964 wheat sales from Australia, Canada, and the United States of America fed one out of nine Communists. This may be a completely erroneous ratio, but under any ratio our food supplies are vital to them. On this basis, within 10 or 15 years most of southeast Asia and China and India, whether communistic or not, will be sorely in need of our help to avoid starvation because of the continuing population explosion.

If we can only be sensible enough not to become involved in Asia, it seems inevitable that within the next 50 years Russia and China will be fighting. My own guess is that it will be much sooner because of the Chinese exploding population which already is overflowing into territory adjacent to Russia. As you know, there have been reports of nu-merous local border skirmishes between Russian and Chinese military forces. Just give them time.

So, Mr. Senator, this one citizen and voter salutes you. May you continue your efforts to keep our draftees-and the Regular Army-from ending up as cannon fodder in a large-scale land war across the world where we should not be involved under any circumstances. We talk about the reluctance of the Chinese and other orientals to lose "face." But our own war hawks insist that we must keep face and not pull out under any circumstances. Far better that we admit we made a stupid mistake in taking such action instead of asking the unilateral United Nations to handle the matter and save many American lives.

When we read about the student protests against involvement in Vietnam, many of us automatically think of beatniks and communistic leadership. This undoubtedly is true in some cases. But maybe there is a large undercurrent of student opinion resentful about being forced to kill and be killed where America's vital interests are actually not at stake. Someday these same students may be the nucleus of a youth party which will carry a swing vote that will be essential to the Democrats and the Republicans. Let's hope that more of your colleagues will begin to utilize your own good commonsense in this matter.

Yours very truly,

WILMETTE, ILL.

HOMINY, OKLA.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for introducing legislation which would permit the sending of volunteers only to Vietnam. Your actions and expressed attitudes on the war in Vietnam makes the growing despair over the course the President has taken in Vietnam more bearable. I am writing to our representatives to plead for support for your

I contend that American women have had no part in helping to shape foreign policy although they make up 51 percent of the electorate. According to a Harris poll in September, 1964, they were voting for Mr. Johnson on the issue of peace. The enclosed is a copy of a news item from Newsweek which I placed on the bulletin board in our Democratic headquarters during the presidential campaign. I helped organize our local Democratic women's club, and now serve as its reporter. I find no strong sup-port here for our involvement in Vietnam, but mostly confusion and disappointment.

You have earned our praise and admiration for your actions on behalf of what we believe to be the true feeling of the American people. (According to Theodore White and other political experts war and peace was uppermost in their minds when they went to the polls in 1964.) The candidate who advocated doing what President Johnson has now adopted was repudiated by the American electorate.

Many of our young people are well aware that responsible members of our society, including the last three Presidents, have expressed the opinion that American boys should not be sent to fight as ground troops for the South Vietnamese Government. How cruel and inhumane are we in this Nation that we could force our young people to be sacrificed on the altar of national pride, because the measures undertaken by President Eisenhower in 1954 proved to be self-defeating?

As an American woman I feel betrayed by these policies which never had the American woman's hand in their making. The President and his advisers, some of whom never have had to go to the people for approval or disapproval, surely did not take into account the woman's point of view on war and peace. It was American women who first proposed voting rights for womanhood. I contend that they have come of age politically, and that a better foreign policy will emerge when their views become reflected in its making.

Yours very truly,

NEW YORK, N.Y., January 28, 1966.

Senator ERNEST H. GRUENING. U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to

assure you of the gratitude of many of us who deplore the ugly war in Vietnam for your undaunted and principled opposition to the present Government policy.

I am sympathetic to the difficulties which political method opposes to uncompromised idealism; however, I feel, as you obviously do, that there are times when the immensity of a moral outrage overcomes the usual and various considerations which determine our actions.

Your proposed bill to send only volunteer draftees into Vietnam is welcome and forces the burden of decision on Congress in lieu of the declaration of war which President Johnson refuses to ask.

I believe that yours will be remembered as a voice of honor in a shameful period of American history.

Respectfully yours.

P.S.-No reply necessary or expected.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING. Senate Office Building. Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to thank you and pledge my wholehearted support for your resolution concerning the sending of draftees to Vietnam.

I think the entire issue of Vietnam should be taken to the United Nations. As long as the United States is in Vietnam with troops, planes, munitions, actively engaged in the struggle, it will be extremely difficult to work out any settlement.

If we have a commitment in Vietnam it is time that this commitment be reexamined in the light of world peace.

Sincerely,

SEATTLE, WASH. Thank you again for your work for peace.

> ASTORIA, OREG., January 27, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING. U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Greatness in a man is the trait which compels him to take what may be considered an unpopular stand because he has examined himself within and the issue from without. Such is yours on the issue of the draft as it relates to the Vietnam situation. I concur wholeheartedly with your analysis of the situation and will give you all the moral support possible. It is fortunate for the whole world that men such as you are willing to stand for what is right and are willing to be counted.

The demagogs may get you-but you are a man.

Sincerely yours,

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for your stand regarding the Vietnam situation. A recent article in the local newspaper

tells of your three amendments, all designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteer for such services.

There is so little we at home can do, but

to tell those of you working so valiantly to end this terrible war, that we are with you in thought and prayer.

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.

WEST ORANGE, N.J. DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to commend you not only for your petition to the President to extend the bombing pause but also for your proposal to stop draftees from being sent to southeast Asia. It is indeed refreshing to hear a voice raised against the "consensus." As I have stated in letters to As I have stated in letters to the President, there are many of us in consensusland who believe the United States is waging an unholy war against the Vietnamese. The tragedy of this war is that many innocents are losing their lives, both Viet-namese and American, because of decisions which are, at best, debatable. At least you have given me some hope that even if the war is to continue, there is a possibility that

some lives can be spared. Sincerely,

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senate.

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for proposing an amendment to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteer for such service.

Best wishes and heartfelt thanks for your work toward, as Walter Lippmann said (January 25, 1966), "liquidating a mistake, for ending a war that cannot be won at any tolerable price, for cutting our losses before they escalate into bankruptcy, and for listening to commonsense rather than to war whoops and tom-toms."

Godspeed.

Sincerely yours,

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Hon. Ernest Gruening, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The January 28 edition of the Cleveland Press stated that you and Senator Wayne Morse introduced legislation to forbid sending draftees to South Vietnam against their will without specific congressional approval. May we express our heartfelt endorsement of such a measure.

The same edition carried the letter signed by 15 Senators including our conscientious Senator Stephen M. Young, asking the President not to resume bombing at this time, and a column by Henry J. Taylor stating that McNamara should resign "on his record in the big questions that really count most." The article was titled "McNamara Computers Missed on Ships." It is no wonder ordinary citizens are confused if those in the inner circle of the Government are not agreed on the issues involved let alone the solution.

Why should our finest youths just starting to live die for such a muddled cause? How can we contemplate an allout war with Red China if we are unable to get supplies and men to even one spot as Vietnam?

Please do all in your power to continue pressing for peace negotiations. You have the support and well wishes of many people who love their country and their sons and do not want either destroyed in a senseless war which will not solve any problems that cannot be solved more effectively and efficiently at the conference table.

Respectfully yours,

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Senator Ernest Gruening, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Tonight I heard that you and Senator Morse are proposing a method of preventing the sending to Vietnam of men drafted into our Armed Forces. I support that proposal. I should like to see the defeat of all appropriations bills for the support of that illegal war.

I have informed my Representative that I shall not vote for anyone in the 1966 election who supports this monstrous war.

I hope Mr. Johnson's proposal to extend the term of office of Representatives will fail. I consider it a typical Johnsonian trick to upset the present balance of power which makes it necessary for Representatives to lend an ear to their constituencies at least once in 2 years if at no other time.

Yours truly,

ALBANY, CALIF.

Senator Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senator from Alaska, Senate Office Building,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: May I express my concurrence with the amendment which has been submitted prohibiting the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam. It appears to me that since this is a war not legally declared by the Senate and House of Representatives then each draftee should have the moral right to decide whether his services should be in Vietnam. If such a decision were possible I think it would surprise the administration as to the number of young men who are not convinced that the Vietnam conflict is necessary to the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

In my discussions with parents of boys of draftable age I have found none who feel that sending their sons to Vietnam is either necessary to the security of the United States nor the most desirable way to preserve the peace. This is a war into which we never should have gotten and to allow its escalation by sending hundreds of thousands of unwilling American boys to fight in Vietnam can only lead to a greater disaster.

A final and interesting comment concerning the publicity given your proposed amendment. It appeared, even in the liberal San Francisco Chronicle, on a back page while the testimony of Secretary Robert S. McNamara before the House Armed Services Committee was given front-page headlines. He reported that we had a missile force powerful enough to destroy both the Soviet Union and Communist China simultaneously. What a happy thought.

Sincerely yours,

ELKMOUND, WIS.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,

Washington, D.C.:

Heartly support amendment limiting conscription without war declaration. Grateful for all your work toward negotiation.

Hon. Senator ERNEST GRUENING:

I read in January 26 newspapers of your proposed legislation to forbid sending draftees to Vietnam against their will, unless Congress specifically approves.

I am very much in favor of this legislation.

Thank you. Sincerely,

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR: This clipping appeared in our paper last night and I just want to say that I really admire you for your stand on draftees. Our son (being married and an expectant father), has received his notice for his physical. This has been his second time that he has been called for a physical. He has a good position and is a good son and husband so you can see why we are in full accord on your stand. We hope and pray that you and others like you will be able to get this proposal through. Good luck and may God bless you.

TOLEDO, OHIO.

Ban on Ordering Draftees to Vietnam Proposed

Asserting that he was free of a Presidential restriction imposed last August, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat of Alaska, introduced legislation today to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

Senator Gruening said that President Johnson told him at a White House conference August 26 that "if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased."

Senator Gruening offered three separate amendments, all designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteered for such service or Congress later authorizes "the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted" into the Armed Forces.

He was joined by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon.

The proposals were offered as amendments to the pending \$12.8 billion defense supplemental bill for Vietnam.

Senator GRUENING said that he told Mr. Johnson at the August 26 meeting that United States involvement in the Vietnam fighting was "folly—that it was a war we could not win—that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disease."

would lead to greater and greater disaster."

"The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment." Senator GRUEN-ING said. "He said that in any event no draftees would be sent to Vietnam before January. After repeating his request that I take no such action, he said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased."

NORTH ANDOVER, MASS., January 26, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I read, with the first faint ray of hope, this article enclosed, in yesterday's Lawrence Eagle-Tribune. As this horrible war in Vietnam escalates and our boys die in ever-increasing thousands, you seem to be one of the few in Washington who cares about that. We realize with horror that Washington does not want to end the war; it only wants to talk about ending it. If there were no money, there would be no war, yet Congress is forcing taxpayers to see their money spent to slaughter their sons—all that makes life worth living for them.

In November 1964 the people voted for what we thought was peace; the vote was overwhelming. It was the only issue. This secret and most accurate poll of all said that 61 percent of the voters, Republicans and Democrats alike, did not want a war in Vietnam. Yet Washington turned a deaf ear to this voice of the people. Why?

In less than 25 years we have had three wars. Our losses in World War II are still open wounds. Then came the fiasco that was Korea which produced 160,000 casualties and left things just where they started. Now Vietnam, the cruelest war of all—one that cannot be won by fighting and dying—a civil war. And our boys are being sent to senseless slaughter by the hundreds of thousands to die in rice paddies of a people who does not want us there, helpless pawns of a government which would not listen to the voice of the people. Perhaps Washington thinks it is fighting communism but with Cuba 90 miles off our shores and communism running rampant in South America and the Supreme Court ruling that Communists do not have to register in this country, it just doesn't make sense. At least the men in World War II believed in what they were fighting for but these helpless pawns do not have even that to sustain them.

Washington has its volunteers—the Reserves. They chose to join. Yet our boys are being forced (drafted) to die before they reach the age of 26—nothing but a foreign legion. They are yanked from college before the ink is dry on their diplomas (if they are lucky enough to be allowed to finish) and sent 9,000 miles from home to die for a cause in which neither they nor we have any belief. This slaughter is fomenting a volcano of anger and resentment among parents, black, white, and yellow all across the Nation. These boys are not machines which can be replaced. They are the dearest possessions of parents, their hope of any future.

A better life—medicare, jobs, money, housing, reduced taxes—we do want these things for our sons. Slaughter them and all our reason for living and working is gone. Only bitter resentment is left.

Sincerely,

BILL ALLOWS VIETNAM OBJECTORS

Washington.—Senator Ernest Gruening, Democrat, of Alaska, proposed legislation Tuesday to forbid sending draftees to Vietnam against their will without specific congressional approval.

The Alaska Democrat was joined by Senator WAYNE L. Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in sponsoring the proposal. The ban was offered in the form of amendments to legislation to provide more money and more economic aid authority for South Vietnam.

GRUENING and Morse are two of the leading critics of U.S. policies in Vietnam.

GRUENING said he had planned a similar amendment to the defense money bill last August but held off at President Johnson's urging.

However, GRUENING said, the President "said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything

I pleased."

He said "more than 5 months have now elapsed. We are still bogged down in an undeclared war in Vietnam which threatens to escalate into a third world war and the price of which in any event in lives and others costs would be staggering."
GRUENING said enlistees had no recourse

but to go where they are ordered.

But an entirely different situation prevails when we reach into millions of American families and conscript these youths to fight involuntarily in this hopeless mess," he said.

> WAPPINGERS FALLS, N.Y., February 7, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am a retired country newspaperman, a Democrat who shares your views about the southeast Asia involvement. It was most gratifying to be able to hear you express your views on the television Saturday afternoon when you appeared on the "Youth Wants To Know" program.

It seems to me that the President by usurpation of power beyond that given him by constitutional authority has put our country in the position of a violator of international law, to say nothing of the obvious violation of our Federal Constitution. Unless the Congress moves rapidly to exercise the powers vested in it by the Constitution we will be well along the road to totalitarian government.

I am heartily in accord with the bill you propose to introduce to forbid the sending of conscripts to Vietnam. It has always puzzled me how the entire conscription machinery squares with the 13th amendment which forbids involuntary servitude in the United States for any reason except for punishment for crime. Since the Government is the only authority empowered to punish crime (private individuals cannot) it would seem to spell out the limit of Government to require such involuntary servitude.

It is my opinion that in contradiction to the contention of the administration it is a minority and not a majority of Americans who favor this Vietnam involvement. ness the tremendous concern evident in the columns of the daily newspapers, the demonstrations taking place everywhere and the tone of letters written to editors of newspapers. Surely the election of 1964, if it had any significance, meant that the people did not want to disturb the peace of the world as they feared a Goldwater victory might result in.

President Johnson, speaking in Hawaii, said yesterday that we were in Vietnam to see that South Vietnam emerged a free country with a free government. Who appointed the United States to this role? The concerned peoples agreed at Geneva on free elections to determine this matter with such elections to facilitate the unification of the Vietnams. Whence is the authority for the United States to determine the future of South Vietnam in particular. Are we not here similar to Russia in preventing the reunification of Germany?

Please keep up the work you are doing which strengthens the integrity of the Congress. Congress can keep in check this reckless, irresponsible administration, if it will, by withholding the funds which it must have to operate.

Sincerely yours,

CANTON, MASS. February 3, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING

DEAR SIR: Please continue the good fight as to the decision of draftees as to whether they will fight in Vietnam or serve their country in some other way. I am strongly opposed to this bloody, futile war, and hope you will oppose it in every way possible.

Yours very truly,

DUBLIN, N.Y. February 1, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for your courage in opposing this terrible re-liance upon violence. God bless you and give you strength to continue your efforts toward

We support you in your resolution to deprive the President of authority to send draftees to southeast Asia (see New York Times editorial, Jan. 31).

We must negotiate with the NLF and stop this evil war.

Sincerely.

LAFAYETTE, IND., February 3, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to express my strong support for your suggestion that the approval of the Congress be required before inducted servicemen be sent to Vietnam. It would seem to me that, in a situation where the Congress has not declared war, the public should, through its representatives, have the right of deciding whether or not large numbers of inductees are to be sent into battle. I would hope that you will press this point in the Senate.

In a war such as this to which a great many people are opposed, it would seem more just to use inducted men in support and supply positions rather than as combat I am particularly opposed to sendtroops. ing married men to the frontlines. (Incidentally, I am not married myself.)

I also feel that any attempt on the part of the administration to expand the war must be strongly and loudly resisted. The arguments put forth in favor of our participation in this war are not very good, to say the least. Any enlargement of the present war can only result in an increase in the number of lives pointlessly sacrificed.

Very truly yours,

NEW HAVEN, CONN. February 4, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING. U.S. Senate.

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We would like to support your efforts to force discussion of Vietnam war through your amendment to prevent draftees from being sent to southeast Asia without congressional approval. We are shocked by President Johnson's arbitrary use of power and lack of candor in the conduct of the war, and by the absence of congressional debate.

You are one of the few Senators who have earned the respect of the voters who elected

Sincerely,

BALTIMORE, MD., February 4, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to you because the Senators from my own State do not seem to be the least bit interested in their constituents opinions.

However, I have written to them asking that they give their support to your bill for keeping draftees in the United States.

You see my husband has been drafted, and I think I am pregnant, and I think that we deserve a future. If my husband is sent to Vietnam, the future doesn't look too good.

You and Senator Morse seem to be a rare minority in that you care about the people in the United States. President Johnson seems to care only about people in other countries and the poor people here.
Well, now that Charles has been drafted,

I'll be poor, because the allotment isn't anything to live off of, and I work for the SSA, and the Government doesn't pay well either.

Today we listened to your interview with Senator Pell. It seems to be the first time an attempt has been made to give the people even a hint of what is really going on in Vietnam, and even after all the talk on the program, it still isn't clear.

Please keep trying to get that bill through and keep up the fine job you've been doing. wish there were more Senators like you.

Sincerely,

LONDON, ENGLAND, February 4, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: As Americans temporarily living in England where U.S. prestige is low because of our involvement in the Veitnamese war, we are proud of your continuing efforts to stop escalation of this terrible conflict.

We especially wish you well with your amendment providing that no draftees be sent to southeast Asia without congressional approval.

Sincerely.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., February 6, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I urge you to withhold your support for further war appropriations until open and complete hearings have been held.

I commend you for your continued and forthright opposition to this immoral and illegal war. Never in history has one nation been quite so wrong as are we, now.

Most sincerely,

RENTON, WASH. February 4, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We read about your amendment on not sending draftees to

We deeply appreciate your efforts in the behalf of our boys and also the poor people of Vietnam caught in a war that is not of their making and must be horrible beyond all imagination in this day of modern warfare.

We want to thank you again and also Senator Morse in your fight to bring some kind of reason to the world today.

Will you please convey our thanks to Senator Morse?

Sincerely.

JERICHO, N.Y., February 2, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I hope I spelled your name properly. Just want you to know that I am just one of the people out of many that are in favor of your bill which you sent to the legislature 2 weeks ago. Draftees should not be sent to Vietnam unless they volunteer.

We have not been a family who have shirked their duty to their country when it has been needed.

My father-in-law served in World War II. He had three Purple Hearts.

My husband was in the Battle of the Bulge.

He has three Purple Hearts. My 20-year-old brother was killed in World War II. He was an only son.

Both my brothers-in-law served in World War II. One stayed in the Air Force for 20

My son was drafted in October. He was working 40 hours a week at the time. This was to enable him to go to night college and when he had enough saved to matriculate to days. Since his country needed him he had to put his plans aside. He made up his mind he would do the best he could for his country.

It is a heartbreak for every mother, father, grandfather and grandmother to see these young boys go. They might as well send young boys go. us with them when they send them to Vietnam. We have been through so many years of war. If these young men were given a choice I don't think it would be quite so hard on the parents. I also think it might help to do away with some of the demonstrations we've been having especially with the college students. I know if my son was given the choice and it was his decision to go I would feel better because I would know this is what he wanted and believed in. A lot of the boys with my son have had quite a bit of college. It seems so horrible to be making foot soldiers out of them and sending them to the slaughter like this without a choice. Now for the ones that don't want to go, there are many other jobs they can serve their country doing. There is no declared war in Vietnam. Most of the draftees are fine young boys with good educations. Who is going to run this country 20 years from now? The way they are going, all that is going to be left here is the morons that the service doesn't want. It takes a lot of educated men to run a country like this as well as soldiers to protect it. I hope these boys are given a chance to make a choice. I sincerely hope like many other people your bill goes through. Respectfully yours,

P.S.—When a draftee is sent by choice he can do more for his country than 10 that are sent by force.

> SAN MATEO, CALIF., February 14, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING. Senate Office Building, Washington D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wish to express to you my sincere thanks for your amendments 481, 482, and 483 to Senate bills Nos. 2791, 2792, and 2793. I have written Senators Kuchel and Murphy from my State of California, urging them to support your amendments.

I have the firm conviction that it is dead wrong, grossly immoral, and diametrically opposed to the principle of constitutional, democratic government that our President should be allowed to send our soldiers into battle of the magnitude of that in Vietnam without specific authorization by the Congress. And it is high time that the terrible mistake of our deepening involvement in Vietnam be thoroughly examined, publicly, by the Senate, and all of Congress. The adoption of your amendments would force such an examination.

I also feel that it is high time that Congress and the President, and the administration, put a little less stress on the state of the economy and the stock market, and a little more on the sanctity of human lifeeven that of our alleged enemies.

Again, my sincere thanks to you, Senator GRUENING. Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

BETHESDA MD

Senator ERNEST GRUENING. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: For some time I have admired your forthright statements on

the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Now I think you deserve commendation particularly for the introduction of legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to South Vietnam. This is undoubtedly the most democratic and American move that could be made to help solve our difficulties there. If your bill should become law, we would all very quickly see who sincerely believes the sacrifices of American men money in Vietnam are worthwhile. I thank God that there is a person of your intelligence and courage in the U.S. Senate.

I am writing to the Senators and Representatives from my own State of Maryland asking them to support your bill, and if there is any other way in which I could help you in your work I would be only too glad to do anything within my ability.

Sincerely yours,

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

Hon. Ernest Gruening, Senator, State of Alaska, Senate Office Building,

Washington, D.C.
DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I was greatly cheered to learn in the San Francisco Chronicle of January 26, 1966, that you have offered three amendments to bar the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

While I realize that the chance of any amendment of this type to be adopted is extremely low, I am happy to know that at least two Senators, you and Senator Morse, represent my view on this question.

Very, recently, I attended a special meeting for parents at our church in which our minister explained the current draft law with regard to objectors. I came away deeply disturbed and angry after learning that, at present, the chances for an alternative to combat service are good if the boy is absolutely against war under all conditions; however, if he objects to the Vietnam war, but not to defensive war, he has only the choice of accepting military service or going to jail for 5 years with loss of certain civil rights following release.

I asked how this condition differed from that of a German boy's choice under Hitler or a Roman during the imperial period. Our minister felt that a 5-year prison sentence is a milder punishment than could be expected in Hitler's Germany or imperial Rome.

I am far from satisfied that the choice of surrender of conscience or surrender to prison is good enough for an American boy when our country is not at war, nor is being threatened in any way. To present to a boy at age 18 this requirement for corpse-like obedience is to deny freedom of thought and action that his teachers have trained him to consider his American heritage.

If a path consistent with justice and good conscience is not to be found, the result will be corrupting in some form. Passivity, resignation, cynicism, hostility, rebellion, outright disloyalty are examples of many negative attitudes that could develop from repressed conscientious dissent.

I think that a free America would not treat its sons this way because it is wrong to do so. I think that a strong America (able to destroy Russia and China simultaneously) should not destroy the spirit of its youth this way because it is unnecessary in view of these circumstances:

1. So far, President Johnson has not thought it necessary to ask Congress for a declaration of war.

2. The armed services have not considered that an emergency exists which requires calling up reserves.

3. Soldiers in Vietnam return to the United States when their enlistment is over (even just after arrival there according to reports) indicating that total exposure both to the Army indoctrination and to the Vietnamese

situation has not convinced them that they have any duty in Vietnam that conscience dictates. (The French would not support a heavier draft during their period of fighting there even though the alternative was the loss of all of Indochina.)

4. I have never felt that the armed services and Congress have fully exploited the possibility of maintaining peacetime strength by voluntary enlistment. If we are to be a worldwide police force, our policemen should be recruited as are those in cities and States, by adequate inducements to compensate for risks and hardships involved.

Besides being both wrong and unnecessary to deny freedom of choice regarding service in Vietnam, this denial threatens the welfare of the United States. The alienation of a reluctant soldier, his family, friends, and sympathizers may harm the United States much more than the soldier could hurt the Vietnamese. Paul Potter has summarized the convictions of many less articulate when he declares that, "To live decently in this society, to do what you believe is right, is self-destructive." How much of this despair lies below the surface phenomena of drug use, sexual liberatinism, al-coholism, the defiant style of dress and appearance which offend and bewilder conventional people?

My only hope is that courageous men such as you and Senator Morse will gradually persuade more people at all levels to your point of view and we will halt our drift toward our version of Roman imperialism before either internal rot or external reprisal have destroyed us.

Very truly yours,

TRANQUILLITY, N.J. February 12, 1966.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have delayed far too long in expressing my appreciation for your outspoken criticism of the administration's policy on Vietnam.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I am sending to the President. It is not necessary to rehearse any of the arguments which I have presented to him. Let me, simply, express my hope that you, together with some of your colleagues, will be able to find a way to convince the President that there is far more dissatisfaction with his policy than he seems willing to recognize; and, further, that the Senate will insist on reasserting the constitutional demand that Congress shall have a voice in determining whether or not this country shall carry on a war.

Let me, further, express my support for your amendment to prohibit sending draftees to Vietnam except as volunteers without the consent of Congress. I am sure, furthermore, that you will oppose any measures which Mr. Johnson can interpret as endorsement of, or support for, his policy, or as a blank check for further action.

Respectfully yours,

FEBRUARY 12, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, The White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: With millions of people in all parts of the world, I was encouraged by your action in taking the problem of Vietnam to the Security Council of the United Nations; and by your continued expressions of determination to seek for a negotiated end to the war. Inasmuch as American intervention has vastly exceeded in quantity and quality of troops and arms the intervention by North Vietnam, the United States may well take the initiative to set the example for radical deescalation of

the conflict. I urge, therefore, that we deescalate the conflict and make clear our readiness to negotiate not only with Hanoi, but with the NLF as a principal party to any settlement, inasmuch as the war was origi-

nally, in essence, a civil war.

That there may well be risks in this, I recognize; but I am sure that they are not as dangerous as the certainties which are entailed by continued escalation of the conflict. For this reason, I deplore your order to resume the bombing in North Vietnam, as a threat to world peace. One thing has been demonstrated by this policy initiated a year ago: it has served, as nothing else has done, to solidify the Government of Hanoi and the people of North Vietnam in their determination to fight. That this could have been expected has been demonstrated again and again throughout history: e.g., in the re-sponse of England to the German bombing in World War II.

As our Government has repeatedly stated, throughout three administrations, in respect to various declarations by the U.S.S.R. concerning peaceful intentions, it must be actions, not words, that count. To declare that we seek peace while intensifying the war, can only result in our professions carrying no weight but being under suspicion. Declarations by the Secretaries of State and Defense, by the military, as well as your own statement, have interpreted our actions as being motivated, controlled, and made necessary only for the purpose of stopping the aggression and protecting the freedom of the South Vietnamese people. However, may I respectfully call your attention to the sequence of developments following 1954, which I am sure are quite familiar to you (although they have been frequently ignored or distorted in statements to the people) claims? which do not substantiate our Rather, aggressive military action by North Vietnam has been demonstrated (as in the facts of the white paper by the State Department last spring) to have been largely in response to our action.

Allow me, Mr. President, respectfully but most urgently to protest against the policy which our Government is pursuing in Vietnam, in spite of clear demonstration of mounting dissatisfaction with that policy, not only by the people at large but by many of the most competent leaders of your party in Congress. It is my conviction that to persist in our present course will not only lead to world war, but will earn for the United States the loss of respect of much of the It would be ironic, and unfair to you, with your demonstrated concern, and consistent efforts, for the kind of society which will make possible a better life for all men, if you should continue to be imprisoned by the kind of policy initiated by Mr. Dulles (and persisted in by Mr. Rusk). It was this policy which was a part of the total outlook which was repudiated by the people in 1960 and even more emphatically in 1964.

> ORANGE, CALIF., February 9, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We fully support the legislation introduced by you last week and supported by Senator Wayne Morse, prohibiting the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam. Let those who feel strongly about forcing American freedom on the Vietnamese people go forth and do the fighting. Those who feel it is an unjust war should not be forced to defend our freedoms on someone else's soil.

We feel the Geneva agreements should be lived up to and all foreign troops be withdrawn from Vietnam. Let them have their free elections as was proposed in the Geneva agreements, but let them be free of foreign intervention and domination. We are also

in favor of foreign aid to Vietnam after our troops are withdrawn and some responsible person be in charge of administering the foreign aid so as to prevent the aid from getting into the hands of enemies of the people, so the people can rebuild their economy.

Yours truly,

PALO ALTO, CALIF., February 10,1966.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Allow me to congratulate you on your amendments to the Vietnam aid bill-that I understand would prohibit sending our fine young American boys into southeast Asia against their will, without the approval of Congress, inasmuch as the war there is not authorized by the U.S. Congress.

Sincerely.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., February 5, 1966.

ERNEST GRUENING, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We support your amendment concerning the necessity of congressional approval for draftee shipment to Vietnam.

> WINNETKA, ILL., January 26, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your proposal to make Vietnam service voluntary.

> NEW YORK., N.Y., January 26, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Washington, D.C .:

Thank you, bless you for your efforts to change backward, shameful, Rusk Vietnam policy. Your draftee idea is great.

NEWINGTON, CONN., January 29, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I read in the paper on how you don't want the draftees to go fight in Vietnam unless Congress approves. I hope you keep up the fight as all the mothers are with you 100 percent.

As a mother I am in favor of it as my son just left for the Army. It was just 22 years ago I sent my husband and brothers off to war. I never thought I'd live to see the day my son would be in uniform to do the job. I thought his father and uncles had finished the job. Our joy was short lived.

I am an American and if I could see why we are there maybe I wouldn't feel this way. But I have never had a clear picture of why we are in Vietnam.

We should clean up our own country of Commies before we try to do it somewhere

Everyone I have talked to and that is many people are not in favor of this conflict. When you say war they disagree with you as its a police action like Korea, they tell me. I told them to ask a mother who lost a son and see what she'd tell them.

Something else I can't understand is why we are there and not the United Nations. I thought that was formed to try and keep peace. How come we are the only country I thought that was the whole idea of there. it being.

They take a boy 18 or 19 away from home. He can't vote and his parents are responsible for him. Yet the Army takes him, sends him where they want to and the parents don't even know where. Is this the country that we fought so hard for or is this just something I imagined. Where my son is right now, I don't know. My husband has a heart condition and he is not to worry but he is as upset as I am only he don't want me to know

You keep up with your good work and I hope God is on both our sides.

Yours truly.

YAKIMA, WASH.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your stand re: draftees. These men, my son included, are not unpatriotic, there are very few draft-card burners among them-they simply find themselves thrown into a socalled political war which somehow requires the presence of 400,000 men (projected) to enforce this political ideology.

My son, and dozens of others I know, go reluctantly, but with that indomitable spirit of indestructibility, that enviable assurance that come what may, each will come out all right. As you well know, this has not and will not be so—let the professional soldier, the volunteer—fight in Vietnam. Don't force our sons who have been drafted march involuntarily to their deaths in a land 12,000 miles away; a land they know and care little about.

As you know, our position in Vietnam is untenable, ill-advised and contrary to our democratic beliefs.

Please do all you can to enact legislation to keep our draftees home where they belong-with millions of trained men, we can then withstand, even overcome any overt acts of direct aggression.

Sincerely,

SENATOR ASKS DRAFTEE BAN IN VIETNAM

WASHINGTON .- Asserting he was free of a Presidential restriction imposed last August, Senator Ernest Gruening, Democrat, of Alaska, introduced legislation today to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

In a Senate speech, GRUENING said President Johnson told him at a White House conference August 26 that "if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased."

GRUENING offered three separate amendments, all designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteer for such service or Congress later authorizes the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into the Armed Forces.

He and Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, offered the proposals as amendments to the pending \$12.3 billion defense

supplemental bill for Vietnam.

GRUENING said he told Johnson at the August 26 meeting that U.S. involvement in the Vietnam fighting was folly; that it was a war we could not win; that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disaster.

"The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment," GRUENING said.

PACIFIC GROVE, CALIF., January 30, 1966.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for your part in challenging the President's authority, assumed under the southeast Asia resolution, to wage an expanding undeclared war in southeast Asia. Thank you also for your proposal to make service in Vietnam on a voluntary basis. (This does not affect me, as I am above the draft age—60.)

I have been grieved and concerned for a long time about our Nation's policies and actions in Vietnam. Reading Senator ED-WARD KENNEDY'S "Fresh Look at Vietnam" in the current issue of Look magazine has deepened my concern, and I hope it has that effect on his fellow Senators.

Respectfully yours,

MADISON, WIS.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Senate Office Building. Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: As potential draftees, and as citizens of the United States who are opposed to the war in Vietnam, we would like to give our full support to your amendment that would bar the use of draftees in this unjust and unnecessary war. When 200,000-plus soldiers are fighting in a war that has never been declared as such, the absence of any substantial senatorial criticism is truly criminal. It is heartening to see that you and a few others have the courage to stand up against this war.

We hope that you continue in your posi-tion, and defend it as adamantly as you have in the past.

Sincerely.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator Ernest Gruening, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to encourage you in your fight for your legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

I certainly hope you will succeed in getting this legislation through at once and will thus give those who wish to fight in Vietnam, along with the regular military personnel, an opportunity to do so. Yesterday's Oregonian suggested that soon the Korean war policy would begin to operate here. It means simply that the lower half of the freshman classes at various colleges would be removed for the draft, and it would continue on up to the lower quarter of the junior class. This seems very unjust to me, and a bit insane, too. If a student is serious in his pursuit of a degree in a vital profession, why not allow him to complete his education first? Then let him take his place among the ranks, too, or use him wherever his education can do the most good. But in the meantime, why not use the reservists first who are being trained and paid to fight when needed?

I do hope your sane and just proposal, as well as your good judgment, will prevail. Sincerely yours,

> SWITZERLAND. February 4, 1966.

Senator E. GRUENING. The Senate of the United States, Washington, D.C.

into catastrophic proportions.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I should like to express my deep approval of your resolution to deprive President Johnson of authority to send draftees to southeast Asia. As the mother of an all too soon to be draft age son I am most personally interested in the draft situation. As an American citizen I am exceedingly distressed by the war in Vietnam which I consider an outrage against the people of that country and against the very principles for which we say we standbrought about without the consent of the citizens and slowly and dishonestly escalated

President Johnson has ignored the justified demand from Hanoi to include the Vietcong in discussions and his peace feelers have come to naught-as was to have been expected. With the resumption of bombard-ments by the United States we have entered once again into a state of Alice-in-Wonderland logic—a topsy-turvey reasoning that we can save a country and its people by smashing them to death.

I hope you, and such honest and outspoken critics of current U.S. foreign policy as Sen-

ator Morse, will continue to act for the establishment of peace and for the protection of innocent victims of this cruel war-both American and Vietnamese.

Very sincerely,

MILLBRAE, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: A request. Will please suggest a solution to the Vietnam problem that will appeal to American conscience.

I belong to a group called Concerned Citizens of San Mateo County. The group feels that if we had something that would really move the general run of Americans, we would go allout to contact people.

If I had something mimeographed on a card (about the size of a postcard) -it could be printed on both sides—I could carry 50 or so in my pocket and give them out each day.

What do you think?

Sincerely.

P.S.-We could flood the country with a

Mr. GRUENING. So, Mr. President, we are confronting perhaps the gravest crisis in the history of our Nation. I say 'perhaps the gravest crisis" because, in times past, when our Nation went to war, there was a large degree of unity, there was widespread patriotic support, based on real and justified conviction that our safety, our lives, our way of life, and everything that America stood for and holds dear were in grave danger. Under those circumstances, our people willingly

marched to war.

That is not the situation today in regard to southeast Asia. I repeat my view that our alleged commitment lacks reality, is not based on any sound foundation, is in violation of the Constitution. Now the myth that we were asked in there by a friendly government, and acceded to that request, that three Presidents have supported that commitment, and that it has become a solemn national pledge has been pretty well dis-posed of by elucidation of the true These facts are that we asked ourselves in, that President Eisenhower did not promise, but merely offered economic aid-and that with many conditions, none of which were ever fulfilledand that President Kennedy merely added to our advisory role by sending some 15,000 to 20,000 advisers. But it is only in the last year or so that we have sent our men into combat, that we have made war without a declaration of war voted by the Congress. The latest justification, now being refurbished, stems back to the SEATO treaty, in which it is alleged we made a commitment to do what we are doing.

But when one examines the SEATO treaty one finds that in the first place, we are in violation of that treaty, because in article 1, the very first article. it says:

The parties undertake, as set forth in the charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and re-frain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Therefore, as we have gone to war, as we have used armed force, we are in violation of the very treaty which is now invoked as a justification for our actions.

It is pleaded by those who use this SEATO Treaty as a later justification for action that article 4 says:

Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unani-mous agreement may hereafter designate. would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

In other words, if we are to fulfill the obligations such as they are now alleged to be under the SEATO Treaty, we would have had to go to Congress and ask for a declaration of war, which we have not done, for that way, and only that way would we be acting "in accordance with" our "constitutional processes."

Consequently, this later argument, now dredged up, when the previous arguments are shown to be mythical, also falls to the ground

It is a tragic situation for those of us who deeply love our country, who have been steeped in its ideals and traditions, to have to stand by and see the course we are following. That course can only lead to disaster. It is already disaster. It is time we confessed to error—the greatest, most tragic error we have made in our history-and use every decent means to get out at the earliest possible moment. Any withdrawal which will stop the useless slaughter of American boys and the killing of civilians would be preferable to continuation of the course in which we are now involved.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1 AUGUST 20, 1965.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It was very good of you to see me yesterday and to give me the opportunity to present to you my views on the present situation in Vietnam.

Enclosed is a copy of the speech I had on my desk when I spoke to you yesterday. This was prepared for delivery yesterday and in it I offered an amendment to the defense appropriation bill prohibiting the sending of draftees, without their consent, to southeast You will recall I spoke to you twice about this, and that at your earnest request

agreed not to introduce this amendment. In compliance with your wish, I shall not introduce this amendment at this time, although I feel deeply that at the very least the Congress should pass on the sending of our draftees into the war in southeast Asia.

However, as I suggested to you at our meeting, I strongly urge you to announce publicly that—at least until there has been a review of the entire situation after the Congress returns in January or unless a grave national emergency develops—draftees will not be sent to southeast Asia unless they volunteer for such duty. Such a public announcement from you would do much to reassure the people of the United States.

I was pleased to hear from both you and Ambassador Goldberg of the strenuous efforts to secure peace in southeast Asia. As I told you, I was particularly gratified to notice your clarification of your position since your Johns Hopkins speech. announcement at your press conference on July 28, 1965, that there would be no particular problem in bringing the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front to the conference table, as I had been urging for some time, was most reassuring.

I was also pleased to hear your changed stand on the reunification of Vietnam through internationally supervised elections as provided for in the Geneva Conventions of 1954. Of course, as I said, it is difficult to convince those with whom we are seeking to arrange a cessation of hostilities of our bona fides while we continue the bombing of North Vietnam.

With best wishes, I am, Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senator.

Ехнівіт 2

[Parade, the Washington Post, Jan. 30, 1966]
Universal draft. Young men the world
over are facing the same problem: military
conscription. Britain (alone of the great
powers), India, and Pakistan are among the
few large countries relying solely upon voluntary enlistment in this deeply divided
world. Poverty is so rampant in India and
Pakistan that there are more volunteers than
military facilities to house, clothe, and feed
them.

Elsewhere the rule is conscription. In the Soviet Union all youths 17 and 18 who have completed secondary school are inducted. Service ranges from 2 to 5 years with leave only for emergency or outstanding service. Pay is \$3.30 per month. Israel, surrounded by hostile Arab nations, requires military training of all men and unmarried women, 18 to 26. Reserve duties are obligatory for men until age 49, for childless women until age 34. In Red China which has a virtually bottomless pool of manpower, every man according to Maoist theory, is con-sidered a soldier. In South Vietnam all men, 18 to 35, face 3 years of military service. A large percentage of South Vietnamese conscripts desert each year. South Vietnam hires mercenaries to fight against the Viet-South Vietnam We support the South Vietnamese cong. economy. Without us that country would go broke. Whether indirectly we are paying the South Vietnamese mercenaries is a question Washington declines to answer.

Certainly we have fought side by side with mercenaries, employed their aid and information. France, Germany, and Italy all use conscription to supplement their regular forces. In West Germany every youth at 18 is liable for 18 months of service. In France boys are drafted at age 19 for 18 months active duty, 40 months availability,

12 years of reserve duty.

On the U.S. borders things are not so stringent. Canada has no conscription. In Mexico the young man chooses a white ball or a black ball. The white ball permits him to perform his military service by marching each Sunday for a year. The black ball puts him in the barracks and regular army duty for 1 year. Argentina uses a lottery system to select the unlucky few.

Ехнівіт 3

TOTAL IS PUT ABOVE 96,000—U.S. AIDS CON-CERNED: 1965 DESERTIONS UP IN SAIGON FORCES

(By Neil Sheehan)

SAIGON, February 23.—About 96,000 men deserted from the South Vietnamese armed forces last year, a total equivalent to nearly half of the American force that has been committed to the defense of this country.

Actually the figure reported by the South Vietnamese Government was higher, but informed sources said it did not take into account the fact that some of the deserters had later reenlisted. In addition, the figures are considered less than completely accurate because of the crude administrative procedures of the Armed Forces.

Nevertheless, the sources said, U.S. military officials consider the desertion rate very high and are deeply concerned about it.

Total desertions for 1965 were put at 113,-000. Of these, 47,000 were from the regular Armed Forces—Army, Navy, and Air Force—and 17,000 were from the Regional Forces, equivalent of the U.S. National Guard; 49,-000 were from the Popular Forces, or local militia.

The sources could offer no specific reasons for the high rate of Government desertions other than the intensification of the fighting and a general war weariness that has overtaken the country.

Most of the men who desert, the sources said, do so either while still in training camps or while moving to their first assign-

nents.

Figures were not available for desertions during 1964, but it was understood that they had been substantially below the 1965 figures.

Desertions from the regular Armed Forces nearly doubled during the last year, reaching about 14 percent of their total strength. Desertions from the 270,000-man army, which forms the great bulk of the regular Armed Forces, showed a gradual increase during the year. They ran near 18 percent of total strength in December.

The Armed Forces discharged 48,000 men for various reasons in 1965 and suffered 13,-000 killed, 23,000 wounded, and 6,000 missing in action or captured.

OVERALL FORCE INCREASES

Despite the high desertions and other losses, the Government relied on intensive recruiting, more stringent conscription methods, and the return of wounded to duty to increase the overall strength of the Armed forces from 510,000 men in December 1964, to 571,000 in December 1965.

The regular armed forces, for example, inducted 114,000 men during the year—77,000 volunteers and 37,000 conscripts.

Most of the deserters were men who had originally volunteered for service. The Regional Forces and Popular Forces—two militia units heavily affected—are composed entirely of volunteers. A majority of men in the regular armed forces also enlisted.

Most deserters, qualified sources suggest, do not defect to the Vietcong, but return to their homes in the villages, go into hiding or drift into the cities to look for civilian jobs.

Vietcong defections to the Government during 1965 totaled about 11,000. No estimates are available for guerrillas who deserted from Government units and did not report to Government authorities, but the number is believed to equal only a fraction of the desertions from the Government armed forces because the Vietcong usually exercise tighter control over their areas.

FOE STILL OUTNUMBERED

Although Government forces still outnumber the enemy by more than 2 to 1, the Vietcong have shown an ability to increase their overall strength more quickly than the Government. The total enemy force increased in the last year from 103,000 at the beginning of 1965 to 230,000 in December.

About 20,000 troops were North Vietnamese regulars who had infiltrated the south since last winter. About 40,000 more are political and administrative workers who do little fighting.

In another report made available here today, a U.S. military spokesman said that in the week that ended Saturday, 83 American servicemen were killed in South Vietnam, 354 wounded, and 4 reported missing in action. Twelve South Koreans and Australians were also killed, 17 wounded, and 1 reported missing.

In the same period, 197 South Vietnamese troops were killed.

The Vietcong guerrillas suffered 1,357 dead and 122 captured, according to the spokesman,

EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York Times, Feb. 24, 1966] McNamara Hints Call-Up of Reservists for Vietnam

(By Jack Raymond)

Washington, February 23.—Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara told Congress today that partial mobilization and a Reserve call-up would be necessary if the enemy in South Vietnam widened the war. The thrust of his remarks indicated he thought these actions would be required.

The Secretary pointed out, in a 220-page "posture" statement on U.S. global defenses, that the administration had not wanted to call Reserves, preferring to rely on the draft.

But he also called attention to growing strength of Vietcong and North Vietnamese regular army forces in South Vietnam and to what he described as Communist China's increasing militancy.

Mr. McNamara emphasized evidence that the Peiping Government had undertaken serious insurgency in Thailand, similar to that in Vietnam.

HEARING IN SENATE

Appearing before a joint session of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, he said:

"In view of the continued buildup of Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces in South Vietnam, we now believe we should be prepared to deploy promptly additional forces to that area if required.

"President Johnson has stated categorically that we will give our commanders in Vietnam all the resources they need to carry out their mission. The deployment of additional forces to southeast Asia would require some further increases in our force structure and military strength."

After outlining impending increases, most of which had been previously announced, Secretary McNamara went on:

"Although the President has repeatedly stated that the United States has no desire to widen the war in southeast Asia, we cannot preclude the possibility that our opponents will nevertheless choose to do so.

"Such a contingency would necessitate at least a partial mobilization including the callup of some or all our Reserve forces and the extension of active duty tours."

Mr. McNamara spoke to the Senate panels in closed session, but a censored transcript of his report was released. Annually it has constituted the most comprehensive review of U.S. foreign policies and military commitments and plans by any Government official.

As Mr. McNamara testified, the Pentagon announced a call to Selective Service headquarters for the drafting of 900 male nurses beginning in April.

The Defense Department said the conscription of male nurses was necessary because of additional medical services needed for the treatment of casualties from Vietnam and also because of the general increase in the size of the Armed Forces.

Selective Service headquarters announced that the first deadline for student registration for planned draft deferment tests would probably come in late April.

Selective Service said it expected to sign within a few days a contract with a testing agency to prepare qualification tests similar to those used during the Korean war.

In these tests students seeking deferment, who believe that their local draft board might regard their standing in class as too low to be considered "satisfactory" under the draft law and thus not warranting deferment, may take a test. Their grades on the

test may be submitted as evidence of satisfactory educational progress.

DENIES TIMES REPORT

Secretary McNamara, who was accompanied to the Senate hearing by General Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, talked briefly to newsmen after a 2hour morning session in the committee room.

He denied a report published in the New York Times on Monday that the United States had spread thin its trained military manpower because of the demands of the war in Vietnam and elsewhere. The defense Secretary, when questioned about the article, asked General Wheeler to comment first.

General Wheeler said he did not agree with the article but acknowledged that there had been what he called a "draw down" of some U.S. forces because of Vietnam.

Secretary McNamara then said: "It is absolutely false to say that we are overextended and that we cannot fulfill our military requirements.

"We have never been better prepared."

In his formal statement to the Senate devoted committees, Mr. McNamara devoted a lengthy section to rebutting allegations of shortages of arms and other military equipment

After reviewing his logistics policies and reporting on experiences in the Vietnam

war, the Secretary went on:

"This is not to say that every one of the tens of thousands of Defense Department supply points is without a single inventory shortage. Anyone who has had experience with large supply systems knows that somewhere, sometime, something will be lacking."

question of shortages "must be

viewed in perspective," he said.

"The acid test of our logistics system is the ability of our forces to take the field and

engage in combat," he asserted.

"Never before has this country been able to field and support in combat so large a force in so short a time over so great a distance, without calling up reserves and without applying price, wage and material controls to our civilian economy.'

In his assessment of the international situation, Secretary McNamara noted that "the focus of the U.S. defense problem has shifted

perceptibly toward the Far East."

He emphasized time and again the administration's concern over Communist China. In his report he included an appendix containing excerpts of a policy statement by the Communist Chinese Minister of Defense, Lin Piao, last September and quoted Secretary of State Dean Rusk's characterization of it as being "as candid as Hitler's 'Mein Kamp.'

The war in Vietnam is a test case in a Communist Chinese "version of the so-called wars of national liberation, one of a series of conflicts the Chinese hope will sweep the world," the Secretary told the Senators.

Were the effort to bring about Communist

takeover through "subversion, political assassination, and other forms of terrorism" successful in Vietnam, Mr. McNamara said, Peiping would "move forward with increased confidence and determination" elsewhere.

"Indeed," he said, "even without such a success, Communist China already has named

Thailand as its next victim."

The Secretary described the insurgency

start in Thailand as follows:

"A Thailand Independence Movement and Thailand Patriotic Front have already been established. The first is, apparently, intended to be the equivalent of the Vietcong and the second of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam. Large sums of Thai currency have been purchased by Peiping in Hong Kong, and the study of the Thai language is now being emphasized in Communist China.

"In recent months a number of village officials and policemen have been assassinated the northeastern areas of Thailand. Clashes have occurred with small bands of armed Communists, seemingly well equipped and trained; and a Voice of Free Thailand radio station has apparently been established in Communist China. Obviously the apparatus for the war of liberation in Thailand is being created."

Mr. McNamara said that the Soviet Union's leaders "fully appreciate" the perils of local wars that might escalate to nuclear war and that he believed the Communist Chinese were "reluctant to challenge the full weight of our

military power."

"But it is clear," he said, "that we have yet to convince the Chinese Communists that their new drive for world revolution, using what they euphemistically call people's wars, will not succeed. But convince them we must "

He repeated his conviction that if Peiping's "challenge in southeast Asia" were not met the United States would be confronted with it later "under even more disadvantageous conditions."

He emphasized the administration's readiness to "cope with any further escalation of the conflict on their part" and at the same time its readiness "for a just settlement."

"But we have no intention of negotiating the surrender of South Vietnam," he said.

Mr. McNamara hinted that Communist China's aggressive attitude and her developing nuclear capability might compel the United States to develop and install an antimissile defense system geared to a nuclear attack threat from Asia.

The Defense Secretary has been doubtful in the past on proposals for establishing an antimissile defense system against a Soviet nuclear threat, on the ground that it would prove prohibitively expensive for the defense

it would provide.

However, it has been indicated that he believes an antimissile system against Communist China might be feasible because of the more rudimentary nature of the Pelping government's nuclear arsenal.

Mr. McNamara in other portions of his military planning treatise indicated he was considering recommending three rather than one more nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. He also disclosed plans for purchases for the Air Force of the Navy's A-7 attack aircraft as a weapon in Vietnam.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, do I understand the burden of the Senator's argument to be that we should send the Reserves before this Nation sends any more draftees, or is his argument that we should not send anybody?

Mr. GRUENING. My argument is that we should not send the draftees without the consent of Congress. That is all my amendment does.

I think it is about time Congress took little responsibility for involvement down there, and that is what my amendment seeks to accomplish.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My feeling was that we gave the President the authority when we authorized him, in August of 1964, to take whatever steps he found necessary to resist aggression in that area of the world. That was certainly, in my judgment, broad enough to cover putting troops in there, when the North Vietnamese sent their troops in.

The Senator has dwelt at considerable length on the question of the Reserves, and I just wondered if he is advocating that the Reserves be sent; or is he advocating that neither Reserves nor draftees should be sent?

Mr. GRUENING. I am not advocating the method of fighting this war. Secretary McNamara, in the hearings before the Armed Services Committee, stated and I have read extracts from the hearings-that there was very little likelihood of their being sent.

That was only a few weeks ago, and yet today a leading front page story in the New York Times indicates that he

has changed his mind.

I am not prepared to argue that this is desirable or undesirable. I am sticking to the fact which is the basis of my amendment, that I think that Congress should take a position on the matter. I think we should vote it up or down; and that Members of Congress should have a greater inclusion.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows. I was one of two Senators who voted against that resolution at the time of the Tonkin Gulf incident. I have no criticism of my fellow Senators who did not agree with me, but I think there is no question but that a great many Senators-and I think the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me-who voted for that resolution did not realize at the time that it would involve such a large escalation and increase of activities.

There are many Senators who would like to have a reaffirmation of the power of the President, or some variation to bring that authorization up to date.

I do not know whether the Senator from Louisiana anticipated such a large involvement as a result of his support of the resolution.

Maybe he did. Maybe he was more foresighted than others, but I think the issue now is that the draftees, at least in my judgment, are in a somewhat different category from those who entered the service voluntarily, have been paid for it, and are now part of what we might call the regular Military Establishment. If Congress decided it wishes the draftees to go, then it should vote accordingly. If Congress does not decide it wishes the draftees to go as volunteers, then it should vote accordingly. My amendment is an effort to get Congress to express itself and to participate in this great and vital, major undertaking that we have got into.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has stated that this is an illegal war. Is he familiar with article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which explicitly states that nothing in that charter denies any nation the right of collective selfdefense until such time as the Security Council of the United Nations has acted and taken steps to relieve that necessity of collective self-defense?

Mr. GRUENING. Before we get to article 51, there are articles 1, 2, 33, and 38 which forbid the use of armed forces in situations of this kind. I also wonder whether the Senator means that this is a war of self-defense for the United States. I do not consider it so. I believe that we have intruded into another country which is taking part in a civil war and we are fighting their war in a civil war. The question of selfdefense is not involved in the slightest degree, in my judgment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Article 4 of the SEATO Treaty and the protocol to the SEATO Treaty which refers to article 4 are definitely collective defense arrangements to which we are committed. We are there in compliance not only with that treaty but also in compliance with a resolution which Congress passed last year. The Senator from Alaska voted against that resolution. That was his privilege. Since that time, he has made speeches against it about once a week. Sometimes he has done so once a day ever since he voted against it.

Mr. GRUENING. I believe that the Senator from Louisiana overestimates

my capacities.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The vote on the resolution was voted by 416 to 0 in the House, and 88 to 2 in the Senate. The Senator was one of the two who voted against it, and has since spoken against it. This vote represents 99 percent of Congress, yet at least approximately once a week and sometimes once a day, sometimes twice a day, the Senator from Alaska has spoken against it.

Mr. GRUENING. That is because there were 504 votes on the other side.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The overall vote exceeded 99 percent. Congress passed its resolution in both Houses and it was signed by the President. We said that we feel the SEATO Treaty applies here, that this is a collective defense treaty, and that we are obligated to help these people who are defending themselves. We also said that the President should take whatever steps he deems to be necessary to resist aggression in the area.

When we said that, we gave the President a mandate to do whatever would be necessary to resist aggression. When the North Vietnamese troops marched down, we felt—and I feel now and am ready and prepared to say so—that the overwhelming majority of Congress had exactly that kind of mandate for the President in mind that when the North Vietnamese marched in their troops, that the President has the power—indeed, the duty—to resist aggression and to send in our troops if he thought it to be necessary to meet that aggression.

The Senator from Aaska has declared that this war is illegal. Is he familiar with the fact that outstanding law professors of international law, at Harvard, Yale, and in schools all over the country, signed a resolution some time ago declaring that in their minds there is no doubt that not only is U.S. action in compliance with the United Nations Charter, but it is also in compliance with our obligations under the SEATO agreement, and in compliance with the resolution of Congress?

The President did not even really need the resolution. He had the power anyway as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Presidents have done that more than 125 times in the history of the country—even in the absence of a congressional declaration, or a treaty requiring us to do so.

Mr. GRUENING Let me say, in response to the Senator's comments, that there are a great many lawyers in this country who regard it as unconstitu-

tional and illegal. I placed a brief in the Record a few days ago, signed by a number of distinguished law school deans, to which I invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana. But, let us go back to the claim that the SEATO Treaty justifies what we are doing.

Article 4 states in part:

1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

We are not meeting in accordance with the constitutional process. Our Constitution provides that only Congress can declare war. That we have not done. Another thing, this is supposed to be a collective defense treaty, but where are the cosigners? France is not there. They are violently opposed to it. Pakistan is not there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How about the other five countries? They are there.

Mr. GRUENING. They are there, feebly and belatedly, after much prodding on our part. They did not come in jointly with us at the beginning. We did not call any meeting of the seven nations saying, "Come on, boys, let us go in together." We knew they would not go along. It took us all these years to get those few nations to make token contributions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us discuss the legality of what we are doing in Vietnam. A few days ago the American Bar Association considered the question. A distinguished Member of this body suggested on television that our conduct was immoral, illegal, and that America

was an international outlaw.

The American Bar Association is supposed to understand this sort of thing; and after studying the problem they voted 279 to 0, if I recall correctly that what we were doing in Vietnam was entirely legal, in line with precedents, in line with international law, and in line with the charter of the United Nations. They specifically referred to article 51, which states that nothing whatever in the U.N. Charter would deny the right of self-defense, individually or collectively.

This is collective self-defense we are

talking about.

The Senator from Oregon has not seen that resolution. I read somewhere in the press, that the Senator from Oregon said that the whole group which had agreed unanimously should take a refresher course in international law.

Well, now, if they are going to have to take a refresher course in international law, where would they go to take it? I hope they would go to an outstanding university where they teach international law.

Mr. GRUENING. I will tell the Senator where they could go, to some of the law schools whose deans have taken the opposite position.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator may state that there are deans of law schools who are opposed to the U.S. position, but the Senator knows that there are not many schools which teach international law. I happen to be a graduate of Louisiana State University. We do not practice much international law down there. At LSU we do not teach it. Thus, if you wish to study international law, you have to go somewhere else, or buy a law book and read about it. If you want to study international law, a good place would be Harvard. They have been teaching it there for a great many years.

Here is the professor of international law at Harvard—he teaches international law—and he wrote a second letter to the President reaffirming his position, that what we are doing is entirely legal, and that the unanimous vote of the American Bar Association, 279 to 0, is correct. Here is a man who teaches international law at Yale University. That is a good law school. They teach international law there. They agree with us.

Here is a fellow who teaches international law at the University of Michigan. I know about that university. I have read their Law Review many times.

Here is a professor who teaches international law at the University of Virginia, where they have taught international law for a considerable period of time.

Thus, when we really get down to it, if we are to take a refresher course in international law as was suggested to the entire American Bar Association—
I repeat, the entire American Bar Association—we had better not go back to law schools that have a longstanding reputation in the field, or we will have to be prepared to be in disagreement with the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana, was it not the American Bar Association from which the Chief Justice resigned in disgust a

few years ago?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say to the Senator from Alaska, if he has any doubts about the matter, I wish he would make some effort to see what the Chief Justice thinks about the issue here, because he was on television last night applauding the President—I saw it with my own eyes—when the President was making his speech in support of this Nation's position. Whom else is the Senator from Alaska going to rely upon besides himself and one other Senator? There is hardly an international lawyer in America who agrees with him.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Louisiana does not know many lawyers, then. There are many who disagree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I know a great number of them. Let me say to the Senator that there are several right here in the Senate. Two-thirds of Senators are lawyers. Sitting in the Chamber at this moment is the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], a distinguished Senator and a distinguished judge. He is sitting right beside me.

I had occasion to be a delegate to the United Nations to consider these matters. All the Senator has to do is to read article 51 of the United Nations Charter, and he will see very clearly that we have a right to engage in collective self-defense.

That is what the treaty permits, so far as United Nations Charter is concerned. Some have suggested that the issue be taken to the United Nations. All right. We knew that very little would be achieved, but we did go up there.

What was achieved? That and zero are the same thing. That being the case, we have the responsibility to maintain

our position in Vietnam.

Does the Senator want to respond? He had the floor. I will yield to him to respond.

Mr. GRUENING. I shall be glad to respond to anything the junior Senator from Louisiana wishes to have me re-

spond to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Might I suggest to the Senator that what the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] suggests is what could properly be described as a surrender at Washington resolution. It is said that the French were not defeated at Dienbienphu but at Paris, because the French Government did not have the courage to give their courageous volunteer fighting men the help they needed. They would not draft men to send there. They had a number of courageous volunteers who were fighting there for the honor and position of their country. But when they were sur-rounded, no one else came to help the French troops who were already there.

We have sent to South Vietnam some of the finest fighting men in the uniform of the United States, some of which divisions have fought for the United States ever since its foundation, practically. The 1st Division is as old as the country. The 1st Cavalry is practically as old. The 1st Marine Division is an old division. We have the 101st Airborne Division there. We have some special forces. The 25th Division is there. These are among the best fighting men

we have ever had.

I would be embarrassed to have Congress vote that these divisions, which have never been defeated, when they might be confronted by an enemy force, would have no help coming for them if help were needed. It would be a great disservice to men in divisions that marched behind George Washington, to those whose division raised the flag at Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima-a monument commemorating that battle is close by across the Potomac River—to say that no help would be sent them if they were confronted by an overwhelming force. That would not be in accordance with American traditions, because we do not run out on our allies, and certainly we do not run out on our own boys.

Mr. GRUENING. I think the sequel, the subsequent remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, are not particularly pertinent to the subject we are discussing. We are discussing the issue of whether draftees shall be sent to South Vietnam without consent of Congress. I do not question the gallantry or the courage, and all the rest of the superlative qualities, of our men who are there. That is admitted. Nobody questions

that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How about the draftees who are there now? Suppose they were confronted by over-

whelming odds, by an overwhelming number of men who came down from North Vietnam and surrounded them, as happened to the French at Dienbienphu. This country is 190 million strong. Does the Senator propose to leave those men there when they are faced with superior numbers, and say we will not send them any help?

Mr. GRUENING. That is not the issue. They should not have been sent

there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But they are there. The Senator would not have sent them there. He voted against the resolution. But they are there. They are our own boys. Are we to leave them there to be surrounded by superior enemy forces?

Mr. GRUENING. Nobody is going to leave them there. That is not a relevant

argument.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is saying, "We will send no more boys." If they are surrounded, what will we do?

Mr. GRUENING. No; I say Congress ought to stand up and be on record, and if they want to send more boys, vote against the amendment. My idea is that Congress should be on record on an issue of this importance. The only thing on record is the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which many Senators voted for not

knowing what it meant.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us see what the Senator's amendment provides. Am I to understand the Senator is saying that no boys will go over there unless they volunteer? So if a wife or mother says, "Don't go, don't go, particularly don't go, because if you do nobody will help you," what do we do with the boys who are left over there? Does the Senator want to get the boys out of there as fast as they can get out, turn tail, or will they have to stay there without help and die for their country which is capable of sending 100 times their number if need be? Are we going to say that we are not going to help men in the 1st Division, the 1st Cavalry, the 1st Marine, the Airborne troops, if they are faced with an overwhelming force, and, if they are surrounded, leave them, as the French left their troops at Dienbienphu, or would the Senator rather say that we are a nation of 190 million people, and an enemy should not take us on unless he realizes that we are strong and have the courage to stand behind our fighting men?

Mr. GRUENING. We have more than 300,000 troops in Europe, who are trained, many of whom have enlisted, and they could be sent. That is what an explanation of this proposed amendment will show. Nobody wants to do what the able Senator from Louisiana is suggesting. Nobody wants to leave those boys there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was at Fort Polk a couple of weeks ago. I saw some of these boys being trained. Many of them were 20 years old. I felt a little sorry for them, thinking how young they seemed. But then I did not feel so sorry when I remembered that my crew which volunteered to take the first boat of its kind to the beaches of south France in World War II, was about the same age at the time.

As a reservist myself, when I saw some of these young men, sorry though I may have felt, I would not want to take any of them on in a free-for-all fight, because they are to the man well able to take care of themselves.

They are not timorous. They are satisfied they will be successful.

The only thing that would worry them would be to have Congress adopt a law that would result in leaving them there and having them decimated, as the French were in Dienbienphu, when the French Chamber of Deputies did not have the courage to draft men to send over there.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like merely to reply that there would be no question of the united, 100-percent support of any action necessary to defend our country. We are not, in my judgment, defending our country. We have barged into a country which, we are told, has had 96,000 desertions from their own forces, and to defend that country we are sending our own troops to take the place of the deserters from their own country. That is all I am talking about.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. I rise to ask a question.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does
the Senator from Alaska yield to the
Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. GRUENING. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. Well, then I shall ask my question of one and all. I had the honor at one time of wearing the red "1" patch of the First Division on my left shoulder. The boys who belong to that division now are fighting in Vietnam. They were sent there by the Government of the United States. What I am interested in is giving those boys whatever help they need. What I want to know is when I am going to be given the opportunity to vote to aid them.

If the Senator from Louisiana can answer that question, I would certainly appreciate it, because I have two speaking engagements in North Carolina tomorrow. I am supposed to attend a Jackson Day dinner in North Carolina on Saturday also. I wonder whether I should stay here in order to vote to aid those boys who wear the red "1" on their left shoulder, or whether I can keep those speaking engagements, and attend the Jackson Day dinner.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish I could say to the Senator that we will vote tonight, or right now. However, those who oppose the position of their Nation do not appear to be willing to vote. They want to make more speeches. They certainly have that privilege, as the Senator well knows.

From a parliamentary standpoint, the amendment has not yet been offered. I wish the amendment were offered, so that I could speak against it and vote against it. It is inappropriate to speak against an amendment that has not been offered, and certainly one cannot vote against it until it has been offered.

One cannot even move to table the amendment until it is offered. I hope the Senator from Alaska will offer his amendment. He said he wants to go on record on this subject. I want to go on record too.

Mr. GRUENING. It will be offered.

Mr. ERVIN. I share the position of the Senator from Louisiana on the amendment that has been suggested by my friend from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. Personally, I can see no reason for drafting men into the armed services if they are not to be sent to fight.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My reaction to this whole matter is shared by the people of the State of Louisiana. Many of them are confused as to how we got there, but they say, "While I do not understand how we came to be there, the

fact is we are there."

My people say that we should either go all out or get out. The people say they prefer to go all out. The men have not been defeated, and they say that if our Nation's honor is committed, go ahead and fight. They believe in fighting to win, not fighting to lose. Americans do not surrender if they have not been defeated.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have not supported many of the foreign aid programs, which were passed on the theory that someone else will fight for us when the chips are down. I have not been in favor of the United States polic-

ing the entire universe.

The question before Congress now, as I see it, is not whether we ought to be in South Vietnam. As Grover Cleveland would say, we are confronted by a condi-

tion, not a theory.

We are there. Our boys are there. As I see it, the American Government and the Congress should give them all of the support they need. When all is said, there is only one of three things we can do. The first is to settle the controversy in South Vietnam by negotiation. Apparently the President has been willing to negotiate with anybody on the face of the earth, but nobody who can put an end to the fighting is willing to negotiate. Hence, negotiation is out the window for the time being. We have only two alternatives remaining: one is to fight and the other is to withdraw.

I believe that if we were to withdraw from South Vietnam, all of Asia would fall into the hands of the Communists. We then would be confronted by the questions of whether we would stand and fight in Japan, whether we would stand and fight in the Philippines, or whether we would stand and fight in Malaysia or in Australia, or whether we would ultimately have to fight, on the American mainland to defend our liberty.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Illinois stepped out. He may be back shortly.

I believe the Senator asked a proper question to get an answer as to what the Senator thinks the prospects are so far as the schedule of Senators is concerned on this debate. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I had a conversation this morning, at their request, as to what we thought the prospects are of having a final vote on this matter.

I am certain the Senator from Louisiana would not think it improper for me to disclose that it was pointed out by the minority leader—and that is why I wish he were here—that several Senators on their side and several Senators on this side, whom we all know about, are not going to be here tomorrow and Saturday.

I had said yesterday, and I meant it then and I mean it now, that if the bill went through its regular course of debate, the probabilities were that we could vote by the end of this week. I thought so then. I do wish to say that after the colloquy on the floor of the Senate yesterday I was quite surprised to learn that there are substantially a larger number of speeches to be given on the bill than I was aware of yesterday, when I said in the regular course of debate that we could probably vote this week.

But even taking those speeches into consideration, I wish to say to the Senator from North Carolina, I am just as certain as I can be of anything that has uncertainty connected with it—and in debate on the floor of the Senate there is always some uncertainty as to the length of debate—I cannot imagine going beyond Tuesday night on the assumption that because of the absentees on Saturday there probably would not be a Saturday session. But that has not been decided yet, as the acting majority leader will probably tell us in a moment.

Inasmuch as I have been involved in this debate as one who is considered to be among those opposed to the bill, the Senate is entitled to know my plans. My plans are to make my major speech tomorrow. As soon as we call for a quorum it will be a signal for the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] to come to the Chamber to make his major speech this afternoon. I believe there are one or two other speeches today.

Then, I intend to present my amendment on Monday because I have been assured Senators will be back on Monday. I am willing to have my amendment

brought up on Monday.

The difficult matter, the so-called delicate matter, is that some would like to have a unanimous-consent agreement to fix the time to vote. I will not agree to that. A matter of the historic importance of this bill should be handled in regular debate. I will be no party to dilatory tactics. If there ever is any indication that anybody is engaging in fillibuster tactics, I will sign a cloture petition.

After this matter is decided and Congress speaks, there is no question that we have to proceed to see to it that our supply lines are maintained.

I believe the Senator from Louisiana will not think that I am in any way violating any confidence when I say that the information presented to us from the administration is that right now there is no shortage of supplies. But one cannot go on indefinitely without having

shortages of supplies, and no one could justify that situation.

Limiting myself to the matter of schedule, it is my suggestion for whatever it is worth, that we proceed with debate today and tomorrow. I will offer my amendment on Monday, and we can proceed with whatever discussion there may be. I will have bespoken myself on the amendment on Monday. It will take me only 5 or 10 minutes to recapitulate.

Then, I assume the Senator from Alaska will offer his amendment. There may be other amendments. I do not know. I cannot imagine not having this

disposed of by Tuesday.

Mr. ERVIN. I fully understand the position of the Senator from Oregon. I believe that the safety of our Republic is dependent upon Senators standing on the floor of the Senate and expressing their honest convictions concerning matters pending before the Senate.

For this reason, I do not advocate prematurely setting any time for voting.

I believe that so long as a Senator feels he has something to say which his conscience dictates, it is not only his right, but his duty, to say it.

In view of what the Senator has said, could we reach some agreement not to vote before Monday? Such an agreement would not forestall debate or interfere in any way with adequate presentation on both sides of this matter?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the suggestion that the Senator from Louisiana urges most strongly is that if Senators wish to make speeches to please come to the Chamber and make the speeches.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] has been most considerate on many occasions when he felt that he wanted to discuss something at considerable length and felt that it might inconvenience other Senators in getting on with bills that they were trying to have passed. He would, on occasion, come to the Chamber on a Friday afternoon and talk at considerable length.

I remember when the Senator from Oregon was the lone spokesman for the Independent Party of the Senate. I volunteered to sit in the Chamber on Friday afternoons because I know a lot of people like to go away and have a long weekend—as part of the TGIF crowd, "thank God it's Friday"—and like to get away ahead of the crowd to take a weekend rest.

The Senator from Louisiana volunteered to preside and to listen to the Senator's speeches. I thought they were good speeches. I learned something from them. Even when I did not agree with the Senator from Oregon, his speeches were still good speeches for his point of view. He made his record without impeding the conduct of the Nation's business.

It is not within the power of the majority leader or the minority leader to compel a large number of Senators to be present to hear speeches. If Senators become interested and their attention is attracted, perhaps they will stay; but it is not in the province of the leaders to compel other Senators to come to

the Chamber to make speeches or to hear speeches made by other Senators.

The speeches appear in the Record. If a Senator makes a good speech, other Senators will read it. If it is not a good speech, they will make short shrift of it. If it is an impressive speech, it will attract the attention of the Nation, even though a relatively small number of Senators were in the Chamber.

The debate on the pending bill has been going on for many days. The bill has been before the Senate for 2 weeks. We have been debating it for 7 days on the Senate floor. If Senators desire to make speeches, they should come to the Chamber and make them. They ought to be willing to make them today or tomorrow.

If a filibuster is not taking place, Senators should not insist that a quorum be present to hear their speeches on Saturday. Senators ought to come to the Chamber and make their speeches. The bill has been before the Senate for 2 weeks. It was announced 3 days prior to its consideration that it would be the next measure to be taken up. Senators should not require additional time to compose their remarks; they ought to be ready to come to the Chamber and speak on behalf of their position. If they wish to take a stand one way or the other, they ought to come to the Chamber and take it, so that the Senate can reach a vote.

The bill was taken up following the conclusion of a successful filibuster. Now Senators are holding up the consideration of other important bills. Another urgent bill will shortly be reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The tax bill now in the Committee on Finance will be reported next week. The Government loses \$8 million every day that Congress fails to pass the tax bill that will help to pay not only the cost of the war in Vietnam, but also the cost of the Government in general.

So once again, I say that if Senators wish to make speeches, they ought to come to the Chamber and make them. I hope the Senate will remain in session until 7 o'clock tonight. I shall endeavor to be present. Senators who wish to make speeches should not continue to hold up authorizations and other measures that are needed to help our boys who are fighting for our country today and our allies who are seeking to come to our aid.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am not in disagreement with anything the Senator from Louisiana has said. I do not desire to make a speech on the floor of the Senate, but I have assumed the obligation of making two speeches in North Carolina tomorrow. All I am trying to find out is whether I can go to North Carolina and make the speeches, or whether I should cancel them.

Furthermore, I told the Senator from Louisiana a moment ago that as one who at one time had the honor of wearing the big red "1" on my left shoulder, I am ready to vote at any time the circumstances permit to send aid to the boys of my old division who are fighting in Vietnam.

I am also interested in getting some strength for the Democratic Party in North Carolina. A Jackson Day dinner is scheduled in Raleigh on Saturday. I am trying to find out from the Senator from Oregon whether, in his judgment, there is any possibility of a vote being taken on this issue, or any amendment to it, prior to Monday.

I merely wondered whether the Senator from Louisiana, as the assistant majority leader, and also as acting majority leader, would not reach a unanimous-consent agreement that there would not be a vote on this issue before Monday. If he should do so, I could make some speeches, not on the Senate floor, but in the great State of North Carolina.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I cannot give the Senator from North Carolina any such assurance, but I can make a pretty good prediction of what is likely to happen in the next couple of days. I cannot give the Senator any assurance because, so far as I am concerned, we ought to be voting on the measure—if Senators will seek to press for a vote to bring an end to talking—so that people around the world will know where we stand on this issue.

But it is not within my power to make Senators stop talking. That being the case, we are in for more conversation. The Senator from Oregon has informed us that he wishes to speak on this subject. I heard by the grapevine that he is thinking about talking for 10 hours. I am fully confident that he can talk that long; I have heard him do so. If the Senator from Oregon plans to make a 10-hour speech tomorrow, my view is that the Senator from North Carolina can safely go home.

Mr. MORSE. That grapevine had no grapes on it. I have no idea where anyone got the idea that I was planning to speak for 10 hours.

Mr. ERVIN. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana can help me out of a quandry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be no vote on the pending measure or any amendment to the pending measure prior to Monday of next week.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I object.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I gladly yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We discussed the subject at great length this morning. The distinguished Senator from Oregon was as cooperative as I thought he could be under the circumstances. I read into the conversation an assurance that there will certainly be no vote on the bill before Monday.

I discussed the situation with the acting majority leader at considerable length not only today, but yesterday, as well. On the bas's of that conversation, I am quite sure that there will be no yote before Monday.

I have taken unto myself the liberty to say to Senators on the minority side that they are free to go home this weekend to make speeches, to pursue their campaigns, and to do what ever else is necessary, with a free and easy conscience, and with no apprehension that there will be a vote.

Mr. ERVIN. I have the assurance of the Senator from Illinois; but I find it impossible to get the assurance of the Senator from Louisiana. Under these circumstances, I intend to back up those who are fighting the war in Vietnam. They are not forsaking their posts of duty; I do not feel, under the circumstances, that I can forsake my post of duty.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana and the distinguished Senator from Oregon were most considerate of the dilemma that confronts the minority leader. It is one of those things that happen about once in 25 years. They have been most sympathetic, almost to the point where they wept over my difficulties. I am sure that that weeping will endure for more than a night, as the Scripture does not quite say.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from North Carolina is one of the most diligent attendants and most indefatigable Members of this body. I am sure he realizes that we who wish to pass the measure should try to bring it to a vote as soon as we can. The Senator himself has so indicated by saying that the boys in Vietnam are not working bankers' hours; they are not taking off weekends. If they took off weekends, the Communists would likely clobber them on those weekends. The fact that American soldiers are fighting in Vietnam means that we should try to back them up; we should press as far as we can with diligence toward the passage of the bill.

If the Senator from North Carolina feels that it is necessary for him to return to his State, I suggest that we will try to obtain a pair for him, or that we will try to have him return before the vote, in the event that a vote appears to be imminent. We shall cooperate with him in every possible way that we can. At the same time, I feel that we ought, to the best of our ability, seek to bring the discussion to an end without denying any Senator his right to make a speech, so that we may then move ahead with the Nation's business.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Louisiana has said. However, his statement does not give me any assurance that I shall not miss a vote on a bill which I deem to be a bill of major importance.

It seems to me, from what the Senator from Illinois has said, that this is a situation in which the Senator from Louisiana might very well adopt the wise policy of cooperating with the inevitable and agreeing that there will not be any vote prior to Monday.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been trying for the last 8 years to restore the respectability of the live pair. Back in the old days, Senators used to have standing pairs. If a Senator found it necessary to be absent for a week, he would make arrangements with another Senator. When a vote was had, a Senator from the other side of the aisle would simply say: "I have a pair with

such and such a Senator. I do not know how he would vote, but since we are paired, I withhold my vote." The pair would be so recorded. Neither side The pair would be recorded as to how they would have voted. Neither of the Senators voted at all.

That would be taking it to the extreme, but it would seem to me that, with the telephone service being what it is today, we should be able to say that if a Senator has commitments which would keep him away, we could accord him a live pair, and that pair could be recorded as if he were present and voting.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I appreciate that. However, those in Vietnam cannot get a live pair. I cannot see anything to do under the circumstances other than to cancel out my plans. My primary duty is to remain on the Senate

floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My calculated guess would be that we shall not vote. However, I hope that we shall.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the

Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the prospect stares us in the face as clearly as anything can that we shall not vote until Monday. I have tried to cooperate. I could bring up my amendment on Monday and start on Monday.

The minority leader has already said that he has advised people on that side of the aisle that if they have engagements over the weekend they should feel free to keep the engagements, if I understood him correctly. I believe that is the

meaning of what he has said.

As the Senator knows, several Senators on this side of the aisle have already made it clear that they cannot be present on Saturday. Some of these Senators want to get away tomorrow. I am not so sure that we can get a quorum on Sat-

I believe that we shall save more time in the long run if we go through with our regular schedule on tomorrow and adjourn or recess until Monday. could find out when the Senators will get back. I believe that most of them will be back by Monday morning. We could go ahead on Monday or Tuesday and get this out of the way.

It is for the Senator from Louisiana to decide. However, in my judgment, under these circumstances, there will be other Senators who will want to be present. I do not believe that we would profit by holding those Senators here who have other engagements.

I believe that we should go over to Monday.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I appreciate the view of the Senator from Oregon. However, I have noted that when an announcement has been made in the past that there would not be a vote or that nothing would happen. Senators who had intended to make a speech would tend to postpone their speeches until the Senate reconvened. They did this because they felt there would not be the proper atmosphere when many Senators were at home, and people could not care less about what was said on the Senate floor.

If we proceed on the basis that a vote is not likely but might happen, the interest in the debate will be greater. There would be a better chance of persuading Senators to go ahead and make their speeches.

I know that we shall not vote right now. I cherish that hope, but I know

that it will not happen,

I should prefer for Senators to make their speeches. I should hope that we might vote tonight. If we do not do so, I shall accept that result. However, if I were to announce that there would not be a vote. Senators would go home saying: "I shall wait until we are ready to vote, and then I shall make my speech."

That being the case. I hope that we shall persevere in the matter and come to a vote.

Senators can find out what will happen in the next day or so. The prospects of voting soon do not appear to be very good.

I do not want to make a commitment that we will not vote at this time because Senators would put off their speeches. I hope that Senators will make their speeches, and, I am not trying to cut off any Senator from making speeches, but the Nation cannot wait on them indefinitely.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I understand the situation of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. However, I also understand the situation of the acting majority leader. Is the acting majority leader able to give the Senator from North Carolina and other Senators assurance as to whether it is his intention to attempt to call the Senate into session on Saturday? It seems to me that would clear the matter

If I were acting in the position of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I should not make an agreement either. This is too vital a matter. As has been stated, the boys out there do not have any pairs.

I am sure that it would be of assistance to the Senator from North Carolina if it were known that we would not have a Saturday session.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have sometimes given assurance to Senators on my own, not as the majority whip or as acting majority leader. I recall one occasion when I was making a rather lengthy speech on the floor of the Senate at a time when I was outraged about what was being passed through this body. Some Senators said they had engagements. They asked me whether they could leave. I told them: "Go right ahead. I will give you my firm assurance that nothing will happen before midnight tonight."

Senators can assure one another that before a vote is had on Monday, they will make a speech and hold the floor for such a length of time that no vote will occur.

I do not want to take the responsibility of making such a commitment at this time. This is an important measure.

Those who say that we must not vote may go ahead and make their speeches. I hope that no one will tell us that we should not vote because they have other commitments that we should hold up an important measure such as this until they can make a speech somewhere or leave for the week end and then come

I shall cooperate in every way that I can and try to give the necessary notice for Senators to return.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the distinguished acting majority leader. I do not know what the prospects are of a vote on the bill. I hope that we might have a vote at least on some of the amendments to the bill this afternoon or this evening.

What are the plans of the Senator as to the length of the session today?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President. I hope that we shall be in session until 7 o'clock tonight. We could at least get some more speeches out of the way. I hope that Senators will make their plans, in the event we have a quorum call as late as 6 o'clock, to be available.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, no one is more dedicated to the right of full and free debate in the Senate than is the Senator from Georgia. However, I hope that the Senator will give us an opportunity to have ample, full, and free debate. I hope, if we are not going to vote this week, that we will have lengthy sessions next week and that we will get away from this rather desultory system that we have employed until now of addressing ourselves to this bill, and will actually get down to offering some amendments and bringing them to a vote.

This is a very important measure. It does not loom large in the fiscal sense when compared with some others that we see. However, some items involved in the bill are of tremendous importance to the more than 300,000 men who are engaged in this conflict in the Far East.

I hope that the Senator will, as acting majority leader, notify Senators to prepare themselves next week for lengthy sessions in an effort to bring about a vote on at least some of these amendments.

I would not cut off any Senator from the right to have full and free expression here. I doubt whether we will change the minds of many Senators.

We have carried this issue-in accordance with the purpose of those who oppose the measure—to the American people. They have had some week or 10 days in which to make up their minds. They have had all of this matter gone over in detail by conflicting witnesses on the television, the radio, and in the press at great length.

I believe that the jury is about ready to render its verdict, as far as the people are concerned, if counsel for the opposing party will let us have a chance to vote.

I hope that the Senator will serve notice that if we do not get a vote this afternoon, we will have lengthy sessions next week until we are at least able to have a test somewhere along the line as to the sentiment in the Senate on this measure.

Until now many of those who are fighting and killing our boys in South Vietnam might be of the opinion that Congress is likely to adopt a defeatist attitude and refuse to support our troops there and that it might be necessary to scuttle and run, leaving Vietnam under other than honorable conditions.

It would be very tragic for that impression to become widespread among those who are waging war against our allies, the South Vietnamese, and the force that we have sent to support the South Vietnamese. It might mean that the lives of American boys will be spared if we can get the message home to Vietnam that we have put our hands to the plow and do not intend to turn back. If we give them more indication of the tremendous military power of this country, I think we might see a greater willingness to transfer this fight from the rice paddies and the jungles to the conference table.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is our intention to have long sessions if this matter has not been voted on by Monday. I hoped that we could vote on it by Monday, but I do not see that in prospect. I hope that Senators will not make plans that will keep them from being here past the dinner hour. We can arrange to have dinner available here in the Capitol, and Senators can make their plans accordingly, and keep the Senate in session long hours starting

on Monday.

If this Senator is in charge as acting majority leader at that time, that will be the course he will pursue; and I hope that the minority leader will give us his cooperation, and will recognize that on tomorrow and on Saturday, it will be very difficult to keep the Senate in session long hours.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the acting majority leader is correct; and we will cooperate for reasonably long hours.

As I indicated yesterday, I think the time for discussion is passed and we should be taking action. I concur in the statement of the Senator from Georgia; that is the reason I did not think debate could be concluded this week, and I thought a Saturday session would be rather abortive, because there are a good many Senators gone already, the number will increase very significantly this afternoon, and keeping a quorum here on Saturday will be no easy chore.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield? Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As I said earlier, I think we ought to start with morning sessions on Monday, we ought to go right through with morning sessions, and stay a reasonable period each night, until we get this out of the way.

The only difference I have with my acting majority leader, and I have not been able to persuade him, is that I do not think you help at all by simply saying, "I am not going to tell you that you can go." They are going to go; we are going to lose a lot of Senators, in my

judgment, between now and Friday night.

Get these speeches out of the way today and tomorrow; we will have most of the major speeches out of the way by tomorrow night, and we can start then with amendments and short speeches on the amendments Monday and Tuesday. But I say, most respectfully, I do not think you are helping to solve this problem by not being willing to agree to say, "We will start on Monday with the amendments; get your speeches over Thursday and Friday, and forget about a Saturday meeting." I do not think we can get a live quorum on Saturday.

During the delivery of Mr. GRUENING'S speech,

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire with the understanding that his remarks will follow mine and that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am not surprised to note in a news story carried in the Washington Daily News yesterday that:

The Defense Department has censored in its entirety a highly critical report by the Senate Preparedness Committee which charges the Army has serious deficiencies in manpower, training, and equipment.

There may be justification for making this entire report secret and classified. It might well disclose and specify situations which should not be known to this Nation's enemies and rivals.

I wish to emphasize, however, that this is just one further instance of the cloak of secrecy that is thrown around both our military and diplomatic situation throughout the world and particularly with respect to the Vietnam war.

Obviously, any facts relating to military plans and movements should be closely guarded. I, for one, do not wish to know them.

However, there is an aspect of our present situation from the standpoint of Senators and Members of Congress that would be amusing if it did not involve such grave and critical matters. I recently listened to a pep talk addressed to a group of Senators and Congressmen by a high official in our Government. He stressed the need of our Nation's presenting a united front. He urged us to impress our people with the justice of our cause, the efficiency and wisdom with which the war is being pursued, and the prospect of ultimate victory. I believe that his closing words were "go out and preach the gospel." Of course, that is based on the admonition of the Master to the Apostles. He said, "Go preach the Gospel," but he did not add, "re-member it's all classified."

Members of the Senate are permitted to read the testimony presented to committees and subcommittees in executive session. Obviously, it is all classified, and once a Senator reads it his lips are sealed on every detail. He may be subject to suspicion if he uses any of the information after having received it from some other source.

This shroud of secrecy has prevailed ever since Secretary McNamara took over the Department of Defense. It pertained to matters of military housekeeping even before Vietnam. I have never read the recommendations of a committee to the Defense Secretary which led to an order to phase out an important installation in my State. After considerable difficulty I was told I could do so, but every word of it was classified. I cannot imagine that conclusions about the relative advantages of climate, labor availability, accessibility, and costs as between Portsmouth, N.H., and Philadelphia would fortify the Soviets or even particularly interest them. I refused to read the report because I would thereafter be gagged on every detail.

Our people want answers on the broad aspects of the situation which confronts us. They want general policies justified. The letters that pour into my office show frustration, bewilderment, and doubt. How can we reassure them or even respond to them if part of the facts are kept from us and our lips are sealed on the rest?

They are not satisfied with a simple statement that the President is the Commander in Chief, has access to all the facts, and we are sure he is thinking hard about them.

Referring to the report on the condition of our defense that the Pentagon has just suppressed, Moscow and Peiping probably already know most of it. Some of it should be revealed to the American people. Remember the Truman committee, with the express permission of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, investigated and reported on our defense posture beginning right after Pearl Harbor and continuing throughout World War

I strongly suspect that if this report is given to the people, it will be a revelation of glaring errors by the present Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Pentagon Suppresses Hill Report on Army," written by Jack Steele and published in the Washington Daily News of February 23, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBERS FOUND SERIOUS FAILINGS AT HOME AND ABROAD—PENTAGON SUPRESSES HILL REPORT ON ARMY

(By Jack Steele)

The Defense Department has censored in its entirety a highly critical report by the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which charges the Army has serious deficiencies in manpower, training, and equipment.

The secret report, according to informed sources, raises serious questions about the Army's readiness—in view of these shortages—to cope with both a further acceleration of the war in Vietnam and the Nation's other worldwide military commitments.

The report is based on an inquiry begun by the subcommittee last autumn. Its investigators toured Vietnam and Europe and inspected Army camps and training centers in this country.

Completed more than 2 months ago the report was sent to the Defense Department for customary security review. Usually, the Department deletes what it rules is classified information from such reports and clears what is left for public release—a process known as "sanitizing."

But in this case, the Department has stamped the entire report "classified" and informed the subcommittee none of its contents can be made public—presumably on grounds it would give vital information, as well as aid and comfort, to present or potential enemies.

Chairman John Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, is reportedly still battling with Secretary Robert S. McNamara and other Defense officials to get the report clearedthus far without success.

SAID NOTHING

Senator STENNIS and other subcommittee members have said nothing publicly about the Pentagon's suppression of the reportalthough its investigation of the Army's readiness to meet the Vietnam war buildup was well publicized when it was started last

But some subcommittee members are known to be irked over what they regard as the Defense Department's use of its power to classify vital military secrets to cover up past mistakes which cut the Army too thin in both men and equipment to meet an emergency.

Some privately accuse Mr. McNamara of holding up release of the report until the Army can claim that the manpower, training, and equipment shortages cited in the report have been corrected.

MORE CRITICAL

They note that, while the subcommittee's investigation began nearly 6 months ago, the Army deficiencies it uncovered may be even more critical today as a result of the rapid buildup of U.S. ground forces in Vietnam and the recent acceleration of the war.

Senator STENNIS, without mentioning the investigation or report, has called in recent weeks for both stepped up draft calls and at least a partial call-up of Reserve and National Guard forces to meet fast-growing manpower needs.

In a speech last Friday, he warned that the buildup in Vietnam should not be permitted to weaken U.S. forces elsewhere in the world to the point where they might not be able to respond to aggression if it should occur.

Senator Stennis and Chairman Richard B. Russell, Democrat, of Georgia, of the subcommittee's parent Senate Armed Services Committee also have taken the lead in urging the Senate to act quickly on the President's request for additional funds for the Vietnam war.

Mr. McNamara and other Defense officials presumably will be questioned closely about the Army's readiness at closed-door hearings of the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations Committees on next year's Defense budget.

But all such testimony presumably will be heavily censored before reports on these hearings are made public.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from New Hampshire has made a distinguished contribution to the debate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I rise as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee to support the supplemental military authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Maryland may continue.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is abundantly clear to me that the United States is determined that the security of this country is involved in our position in southeast Asia. In support of that position, we now have ashore in Vietnam some 200,000 men in 5 major Army units and 1 Marine unit. We have some 50,000 men in the 7th Fleet at the Dixie and Yankee stations off the coast of Vietnam.

In supporting this measure and the policy of this administration, let me say, following up the colloquy we have just heard, that I should like to vote at this moment; and if we had a chance to vote, this speech would not be made.

But it is clear that we will not have the chance to vote, and therefore the senior Senator from Maryland would put himself on record as supporting the proposition that if we are going to send men overseas and into battle, and accept the casualties that they are now sustaining, then we must be prepared to back them up

Mr. President, with all Senators, I have followed closely the recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I was particularly struck with the theme developed by Secretary Rusk and General Taylor, as to the difference between United States and Communist objectives and policies in Vietnam.

Today I should like to expand that point. For the information of my fellow Senators, my words will take about half an hour, and I can cut them short if the leadership asks me to do so, should there be any chance that we can vote on any amendment or on the pending measure at any time.

Consider first the contrast in the objectives of the parties to the conflict. Time and time again, Communist leaders in Red China and Vietnam have made it clear what they hope to accomplish in southeast Asia. I would note, for example, the recent statement of the Chinese Defense Minister. He said bluntly that the seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of all issues by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution, and that it holds good uniformly for China and for all other countries. Just as communism in China, he said, succeeded by capturing the countryside and then encircling and defeating the cities, so the global Communist movement will ultimately succeed, first by capturing Asia, Africa, and Latin America—thereby encircling North America and Western Europe—and then by finally and decisively defeating the United States and our Western Allies.

And where is this to begin? the Chinese defense minister asks.

It has already begun, he replies. And the principal place in which it is already underway is Vietnam.

Vietnam is now the focus of the revolutionary movement against the United States. No matter what action America may take in Vietnam, the Communist Chinese are unshakable, as of now, in their determination to drive the United States out.

Compare the Communist objectives with those of the United States. I almost hesitate to recount U.S. objectives because they have been so clearly stated so many times by the President, and more recently by Secretary Rusk and General Taylor. Concisely, they are:

First. The preservation of the freedom of the South Vietnamese people to develop as they see fit, without external interference and without serving the policy of any other nation.

Second. A cessation of the fighting

and bloodshed in Vietnam.

Third. Protection of the rights and authority of the free Republic of Vietnam

Fourth. Demonstration to the Communist bloc that indirect aggression through so-called wars of national liberation cannot succeed and to the free world that the United States stands by its commitments.

The central objective of the President's policy, then, is independence for South Vietnam and freedom for its people to live in peace. I support that policy. Realization of this objective is necessary to the broader goal of creating conditions of stability throughout southeast Asia sufficient to permit a broad development program to which, as the President has stated, we should be prepared to contribute substantially.

We seek this objective in Vietnam in our own national interest. To abandon Vietnam, which the Communists have made the principal current testing ground for their theories of conquest through externally supported rebellion or wars of national liberation, would embolden the Communists and dangerously weaken the confidence in us of many free nations, with whom we are joined in mutual defense or economic development arrangements. It would mean confronting the same challenge in other places, probably under even less favorable circumstances.

The absence of peace and freedom in South Vietnam is due to aggression from the north and support by the regime in Hanoi for the Communists in the south who are seeking to overthrow their own government. Communist China has been increasingly open in pressing Hanoi to continue its aggressive policy.

It is American policy, constant under three administrations since 1954, to support the Government of South Vietnam in its efforts to defend itself and its people against this assault. We are pledged to provide all appropriate support for as long as is required to bring Communist aggression and terror under control.

Not so long ago, I stood on the floor of the Senate at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incident and voted to support the President in using such force as was necessary to protect the interests of the United States in this theater of war.

In light of espoused objectives of both sides in this struggle, I see no reasonable ground on which to question the validity or, indeed, the essentiality of the American commitment.

If the stated Communist objectives were not convincing, consider the measures employed by them to reach these previously stated objectives.

Despite the buildup of U.S. forces, which I shall discuss later, there has been no indication of any significant change in Communist strategy. Their strategy seeks to:

First. Annihilate and disperse the Vietnamese, United States and other free world forces, while building up the Vietcong.

Second. Intensify military activity around the urban areas, particularly Saigon.

Third. Expand Vietcong controlled areas and consolidate control of the countryside.

Fourth. Organize rural support in order to control the jungle.

Fifth. Intensify economic warfare against the Government of South Vietnam

How do they hope to accomplish these objectives? The Vietcong have a set of simple guidelines which emphasize the following courses of action: guerrilla warfare, evasion, ambush, small annihilation squads, and when possible, large scale operations.

And always terrorism in the night. Basic to all of these has been the use of terror and intimidation. By terror, the Vietcong attempt to cut off what lines the government has managed to build between itself and the people. They kidnap and murder land reform workers, rural credit agents, village chiefs, schoolteachers, and malaria workers. They threaten families in order to intimidate and induce cooperation from workers and officials.

They have no reluctance whatsoever to "gut," to disembowel, or to shoot those who choose not to cooperate. This is a statement of fact. In 1965 alone, the Vietcong murdered over 1,800 civilians in terrorist acts and kidnaped over 10,000.

Behind all this terror lies an even more dangerous threat to the freedom of South Vietnam-aggression from without. The case against North Vietnam has been documented too often for me to need to dwell on it at length here. Simply put, the war which the Vietcong are waging against the south is directed and supported politically and militarily from Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam. It is commanded on the spot by leaders and specialists infiltrated from north of the 17th parallel-19,000 last year alone. It is largely supplied by weapons and equipment sent by North Vietnam, which in turn is supported by Red China.

In addition to hard core leaders and technicians, some 11,000 personnel from the regular North Vietnamese Army were sent south last year. The United States is not, as is charged from time to time, interfering in what is a local civil war.

The actions of the Communists in Vietnam are pure, unembellished aggression. As Secretary Rusk stated recently, aggression itself is the principal enemy of all civilized world orders and of all those countries, like the United States, which support world order under law—and not under force—and through the United Nations.

Contrary to those who say that the United States has no obligation to meet this aggression, I strongly believe that the course the United States has taken in southeast Asia is entirely proper and the only honorable one we can take.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator aware of the fact that on the point of legality, the American Bar Association considered the matter and, I assume, being good lawyers that they are, and most senior members of law firms belonging, they discussed and considered the question and voted 279 to 0 that what we were doing in Vietnam is entirely legal and consistent with the United Nations Charter, particularly article 51, which declares that nothing in the charter would deny any nation the right of collective self-defense.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. As a lawyer myself, I am convinced that to the extent we have international law, the United States is following a legal course of action and that we should and can under law participate realistically as responsible members of the United Nations organization.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Furthermore, recently I placed in the Record a letter signed by 21 professors of international law at our universities and colleges, headed by professors at Yale and Harvard—keeping in mind that a great number of universities do not teach international law, because their graduates have very little need of it for their practice. But these 21 professors of international law agreed to a man that the United States proceeded exactly as it should. I understand since that time 10 other professors of international law have added their names to that list.

So far as I know, there is no professor of international law who has taken a contrary view that this course of action is not inconsistent with our obligations under the charter of the United Nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his comments. I agree completely. If, as a responsible international citizen, we abandoned the world only to those who would apply force, then we would have no law at all. I only wish we had truly enforceable international law. We do have the spirit and fabric of international law, but we must seek to implement this law in support of government by law and not by force.

I argue that unless we face the Communists over there, the last remnants of stability in this already unstable world will begin to disappear. Our reasons for meeting force with force are basically twofold: First, it is in our own national interest to do so; and second, it is the only prudent and honorable thing to do, given the commitments we have made stretching back through three presidential administrations of both political parties.

Let me turn now to a brief discussion of the actions we have taken to meet this obligation.

After the signing of the Geneva accords of 1954 and contrary to the provision of those accords, that Communist forces regroup to the north of the 17th parallel, some of the best Vietcong guerrilla units were ordered to remote and

inaccessible regions of South Vietnam. An estimated 10,000 Vietcong faded into the peasant population. Further evidence of these violations were the large numbers of arms and munitions hidden in South Vietnam by the Communist cadres left behind.

By 1956 it had become apparent that the Republic of Vietnam was a viable and increasingly prosperous state that would not fall peaceably under Hanoi's control. North Vietnam, therefore, began to rebuild and expand its covert apparatus in the south. From 1957 to 1959, over 1,000 civilians are believed to have been assassinated or kidnaped by the Vietcong. Terrorism and armed attacks greatly increased between 1959 and 1961. This is the record. During all this period the American Military Advisory Assistance Command in Vietnam consisted of less than 800 personnel. Finally, in December 1961, President Kennedy in response to a request by the Government of Vietnam increased U.S. strength to almost 2,000. At this point the Americans began for the first time to act as advisers at the battalion level in addition to performing logistic and supporting functions. As the level of Vietcong terror increased, so too did American military support, until the number reached 10,000 in 1962.

Note that the history of escalation in Vietnam was not the result of unilateral U.S. initiatives. What confronts the Communists today is the end-product of their own aggressive military activity.

I need not recount the events of 1965. They are fresh in the minds of us all—the increased infiltration, the introduction of regular North Vietnamese forces, the Vietcong attacks on American bases and installations, the buildup of Vietcong forces in preparation for a monsoon offensive, and the continued atrocities against the South Vietnamese populace. So too is the tremendous and rapid buildup of United States forces to over 200,000 that we have there today.

We should all keep in mind that our response has not been entirely military at all. The military gets the headlines, but the efforts we make in the social and economic fields are supported with equal vigor, and greeted with even more enthusiasm. The theme of the recent Honolulu Conference was on the building of a better life for the Vietnamese civilian. Significant progress has already been made in the economic and social spheres.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I visited that tortured country and saw the active effort we are making in social and economic areas-building schools, increasing agricultural production, training doctors and nurses, expanding medical facilities. To be sure, much more needs to be done, and the President has promised that it will be done. I heartily support these endeavors, without which military success would be without meaning. I am reminded of the few days I spent with the 3d Marine Division in Da Nang and in Hue Phu Bai. I went with the menin wet, dirty dungarees. I saw them greeted with wide enthusiasm. At the platoon level, during sick call, the

American doctors spent a great deal of time treating the civilian population after they cared for our own men. Apart from this, through numerous economic programs, our military equipment is being used to construct canals, roads, bridges, marketplaces throughout the countryside.

But now, looking beyond our present military and nonmilitary programs, we have an even more important responsibility, the paramount responsibility, of achieving and bringing about an honorable peace: not peace at any price, but peace with honor-a peace that would enable the people of South Vietnam to resume their position among the sovereign and independent peoples of the world without fear of outside aggression. If we could be assured of such a peace, we would waste no time withdrawing our military forces.

We would prefer to see our troops at home rather than in the swamps, jungles, and rice paddies of Vietnam. I am satisfied that every responsible official in our Government would prefer to use our resources for the economic development of southeast Asia, not for its destruction.

Unfortunately for us, indeed unfortunately for all mankind, our efforts to achieve this peace have thus far been to no avail. Representatives of our Government have gone to every corner of the world: they have talked to countless officials of foreign governments-friendly and nonfriendly. All efforts have been rebuffed, in fact, scorned would be a better word.

The President said at Johns Hopkins University in Maryland last April that we were prepared to meet with anybody at any time at any place to discuss any issue, and that pledge still stands. We have not been taken up on it.

Recall what occurred during the recent pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. Vietcong activity in South Vietnam continued at a higher than average rate during the pause, terroristic acts against civilians continued, and infiltration increased under cover of the bombing hill

Does this indicate a readiness to discuss peace on the part of the Communists? I think not.

And so the war continues, as indeed it must in the absence of prospects for an honorable peace.

But the question is justifiably asked, is success in the struggle in Vietnam of concern only to the United States and the Vietnamese? I think not. In my opinion, one of the most disturbing aspects of the war in Vietnam is the failure of most of our allies to join hands with us in the fight against Communist aggression. I feel strongly that an effective, lasting peace could be arrived at faster if more of our allies-and I speak with special reference to the sophisticated, modern nations of western Europe-were to share with us the massive burden of helping the people of South Vietnam. In view of our own actions during the last 25 years, the sight of so many of our friends standing idly by watching us, or, what is worse, openly criticizing us, while we fight, leaves me perplexed and unhappy.

At a later date I will address myself to the fact that many of our friends are openly trading with North Vietnam. This is reprehensible to me, and it must

At a time like this, a passive attitude on the part of our allies is both shortsighted and harmful. We are helping the South Vietnamese, because it is in our interest, and because we are able to do so. Others should help, because it is in their interest, and they are able. The attainment of stability and freedom from aggression in South Vietnam serves not only the interests of ourselves and the South Vietnamese, but of the entire free world. All of our allies should realize that they have a definite part to play in this conflict, and that what happens in South Vietnam will have an effect on their own destinies.

Some countries have already recognized this fact. Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea now have many battle units fighting shoulder to shoulder beside our own troops. The Government of Thailand has given consistently firm support to our policy and to the requirements for logistic preparations in their country. This kind of support is both helpful and heartwarming. It is not too late for other nations to follow suit. As we pledge our continuing support, it is reasonable to hope that the Vietnamese Government, and indeed our own, will continue to urge in many capitals a common response to our common threat.

Let me close with a personal summary of where I believe we stand concerning the most real and immediate threat to world peace-the struggle in Vietnam.

The U.S. view of the struggle as essentially one of aggression mounted, directed, supplied, and supported by North Vietnam has been reinforced during the last year by the increasing direct participation of the North Vietnamese in the war and the demonstrated inability of the Vietcong to mobilize the popular support they have long claimed.

The Chinese Communists, through Marshal Lin Piao's recent statement. have made their view of this struggle still more explicit under a doctrine calling for the expansion of Communist power by similar aggressive means throughout the

The immediate implications for the rest of Asia of a failure to suppress Communist aggression in Vietnam remain as clear and ominous as they always have been. In this connection it is not inappropriate to note the increasing subversive efforts being directed against Laos, Thailand, and Cambodia by the Communists and Chinese.

If all small nations on the periphery of Communist power are to retain their faith, that the cause of their independence and freedom is one to which the free world is devoted, we must continue to resist aggression in Vietnam.

If we were to cave in, we would let them down, and our troubles would only mount in the future.

With some degree of accuracy I would like to point to the lessons learned in Manchuria, Ethiopia, in the Rhineland and at Munich where force applied at the appropriate time would have prevented terrible destruction.

Our goal remains one of a peaceful settlement that will bring an end to the aggression, secure freedom of choice for South Vietnam, allow for the withdrawal of U.S. forces, and permit the direction of all our energies to the constructive purposes of economic and social development in southeast Asia.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I compliment the Senator on the very fine statement he has made

Everybody is well aware of the magnificent record of the Senator as a marine officer serving his Nation on the field of battle.

May I say that the speech of the Senator is in keeping with his past record, as well as the service he has rendered in this body. It is an inspiring address. As one Member of the Senate I appreciate it very much.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

I remember that during the same years that I wore the Marine Corps uniform he wore the uniform of the U.S. Navy. We fought in our way at that time for the same cause that men are now fighting for in Vietnam, the cause of freedom in opposition to totalitarianism, or whatever name one may give it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President-Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am prepared to suggest the absence of a quorum.

I understand that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] has a matter that can be disposed of expeditiously.

I would be willing to yield provided I might retain my right to the floor and insist on my right if I find it necessary to insist on retaining the floor.

I yield on the condition that I may

regain my right to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like the RECORD to show that I have been seeking the floor and that the acting majority leader has refused to yield it until he calls for a live quorum. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CANCELLATION OF UNPAID RE-**IMBURSABLE** CONSTRUCTION COSTS OF WIND RIVER INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT. WYO-MING, CHARGEABLE AGAINST CERTAIN NON-INDIAN LANDS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on Wednesday, February 16, 1966, the House of Representatives approved, with an amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 9. concerning certain reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project in the State of Wyoming. Therefore, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House on Senate Joint Resolution 9. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 9) to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands, which was, to strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert:

That (a) all reimbursable construction costs heretofore incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against the total irrigable acreage in the project according to the

present land classifications.

(b) The costs so allocated to land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior if the patent from the United States contained no recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, and the purchaser did not sign a contract to pay construction charges. Such cancellation, however, shall take effect with respect to any individual landowner when and only when the said owner obligates himself, his heirs, and assigns by contract satisfactory in form and substance to the Secretary that he will pay all reasonable construction charges incurred after the date of this Act in connection with the Wind River Indian irrigation project which are allocated to his land as provided in this Act and that such charges, if not paid, shall be a lien against the land.

(c) Land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall, if the patent from the United States contains a recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, either past or future, be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for such charges.

(d) Reimbursable construction charges hereafter incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against all irrigable acreage in the project according to land classifications then in effect, shall be a lien against the land, and shall not be subject to cancellation on the ground that the land was conveyed with a paid-up construction charge. Any such paid-up construction charge shall be deemed to mean a construction charge incurred prior to the date of this Act.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should say also that this matter has been cleared with both Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGee and Mr. Simpson]. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the acting majority leader for yielding so that this matter could be considered. It will be of great help to the Wind River Indian irrigation project.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall insist upon a live quorum. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 36 Leg.]

Kennedy, Mass. Prouty Kennedy, N.Y. Simpso Allott Simpson Boggs Brewster Kuchel Long, La. Symington Talmauge Church Clark McGee Thurmond Metcalf Williams, Del. Ervin Gore Monroney Young, Ohio Gruening Morse

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BayH], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be requested to direct the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Harris	Muskie
Anderson	Hart	Nelson
Bartlett	Hayden	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bible	Hill	Pearson
Burdick	Holland	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Randolph
Cannon	Jackson	Robertson
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Russell, Ga.
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Cotton	Magnuson	Scott
Curtis	McCarthy	Smathers
Dirksen	McGovern	Smith
Dodd	McIntyre	Sparkman
Dominick	McNamara	Stennis
Douglas	Miller	Tower
Eastland	Mondale	Tydings
Ellender	Morton	Yarborough
Fannin	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Murphy	The state of the s

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I would like the Record to show it was not I, but the acting majority leader, who demanded the live quorum which has just been concluded

I wish to discuss the present situation in Vietnam.

The Senate of the United States has often been called the greatest deliberative body in the world. On many occa-

sions that reputation has seemed ill deserved—as when we permitted ourselves not long ago to become bogged down in a full dress debate on the question of amending the Senate Journal to include the Chaplain's prayer.

But there are also times when the Senate does function in a way which makes it the envy of all the other legislatures of the world. This, I believe, is such a time—and the debate on Vietnam which we are now conducting demonstrates how great a body this can be when it does its best.

There is one point which has become increasingly clear to me during the course of this debate:

The United States should never have become involved in a ground war on the land mass of Asia.

For the 11 years since the French withdrawal from Vietnam, the United States has been gradually sucked into a situation where 200,000 American troops are presently fighting what is essentially an American war on the Asian mainland. Originally, and indeed until the end of 1963, American policy was to call upon various South Vietnamese governments to win or lose their own war. As President Kennedy said in September of 1963:

In the final analysis, it's their war. They're the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it.

As late as the fall of 1964 this was still our policy. President Johnson said, during the course of the Presidential campaign that he did not like to be called upon "to send American boys to do the job that Asian boys ought to do."

The State and the Defense Departments still insist today that primarily this is a war for the South Vietnamese to win; but it is becoming increasingly obvious that the 200,000 American troops now in combat have the primary mission of destroying and defeating the Vietcong and those parts of the regular North Vietnamese army which have been committed to battle.

Thus, for the second time in 15 years, we have ignored the sound advice of Generals MacArthur, Eisenhower, and Ridgeway and committed American ground troops in Asia in what is essentially an American war.

In the fall of 1963 there were only 10,000 Americans in uniform in South Vietnam, all acting as advisers to the South Vietnamese armed forces. Today the number exceeds 200,000 and there is talk in the Pentagon and in the Senate Armed Services Committee to the effect that the number may soon rise to 600,000.

If we had learned from the experience in Burma or the Philippines or, even more recently, in Indonesia, we would have avoided the error we have committed. In none of these cases did our failure to intervene in support of non-Communist governments bring the so-called domino theory into effect. In all three instances the Communist advance was repelled by native Asian governments which scorned to call on the United States for assistance. In fact, U Thant, the sagacious Burmese Secretary General of the United Nations, recently said that had Burma requested

American military assistance there would now be either a Communist takeover in that country or a civil war equivalent in violence to the hostilities in South Vietnam

Our sound position should have been to base our air and naval power on the island chain running from Japan to Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Borneo to Australia and New Zealand. It is nonsense to think that our only stopping place if we lose Vietnam is the beach at Waikiki.

A sound policy would rest our Pacific defenses on this island chain, rather than permitting our superb fighting forces to get mired down in the mud and jungles of southeast Asia.

Let us consider the capabilities and intentions of the Vietcong, the Hanoi gov-

ernment, and Red China.

It is difficult to know for certain what the intentions or capabilities of any of these three parties are. On the one hand, the Vietcong have recently been taking severe losses. It is said that their desertion rate is increasing, that they are losing their will to win. It is said also that Hanoi, having committed a significant part of its well-trained regular army to battle in South Vietnam, is having second thoughts as the determination of the South Vietnamese and the Americans increases. Assuredly, both the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese forces are under considerably heavier pressure than they were a year ago.

Similarly, China is essentially with-

Similarly, China is essentially without air or sea power. There is grave question as to whether the Chinese Army can fight effectively as far away from their national boundary as the Mekong Delta. China has suffered a series of diplomatic reverses. Mao Tse-tung must be concerned at the threat of an American offensive, possibly nuclear in form,

against his homeland.

It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that our adversaries will shortly be prepared to turn to the negotiating table under a cease-fire arrangement by

neutral powers.

On the other hand, there is not the slightest present indication of a desire on the part of our adversaries to stop the shooting. The Vietcong, with the aid of Hanoi, have either themselves occupied or rendered untenable to the South Vietnamese a majority of the land mass of South Vietnam. While perhaps a majority of the people of South Vietnam are still under the jurisdiction of the Ky government in Saigon, most of them are huddled together in cities and towns overcrowded with refugees. And in that part of the countryside still under South Vietnamese control, there is increasing resentment against the totalitarian form the Ky government takes. The Vietcong appear well on their way to acquiring effective control over most of the people of South Vietnam still living in the countryside. And it is no answer to say that this has, to a substantial extent, been achieved by terror. It is, nevertheless, the case.

While the rate of desertion among the Vietcong is significant, desertions from the South Vietnamese Army are heavy, too. As their losses increase, as they have done during the last year, it is be-

coming increasingly doubtful how much longer the South Vietnamese Army will remain capable of carrying the brunt of defeating the Vietcong.

In this connection, Mr. President, I refer to an article from the New York Times of this morning entitled, "1965 Desertions Up in Saigon Forces—Total Is Put Above 96,000—U.S. Aides Concerned."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it seems clear that the Vietcong, Hanoi, and Peiping are still convinced they are winning the war in South Vietnam and that accordingly they believe there is no need to

go to the conference table.

Nor, despite the assertions of Secretary Rusk to the contrary, is it clear to what extent, if at all, the Vietcong are controlled by Hanoi, or Hanoi is con-trolled by mainland China. What seems certain is that further escalation of the American war effort, particularly a stepping up of the bombing of North Vietnam or a commencement of the bombing of Communist China will bring all three of our adversaries closer together. In my judgment, the risks of further American escalation in the light of the capabilities and intentions of our three adversaries. are not worth running in view of the chance of success which such escalation would create.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho. I am glad to have the Senator in the Chamber on this important matter.

Mr. CHURCH. I congratulate the distinguished Senator on the address he is

making.

The Senator raised the question of escalation. I was wondering if the Senator had not been encouraged by the remarks of the President on the subject of escalation in his address in New York last evening.

Mr. CLARK. I was very much encouraged. In fact, with the exception of the last portion of the President's address, in which he raises the question of whether what we are doing in South Vietnam is worthwhile, I believe it was a most helpful statement of the American position.

The address indicates a disinclination to escalation and continued willingness to negotiate.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the text of the President's remarks may be printed in the Record at the end of my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. CLARK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho for calling this matter to my attention.

The tactical military situation in Vietnam is worse than most of the American people think. Neither the State Department nor the Pentagon have yet been willing to furnish an unclassified map from which the American people could

determine just how badly the ground war in South Vietnam has been going in recent years. But maps whose authenticity has not, so far as I know, been denied, showing the steady deterioration of the South Vietnamese-American position since 1962 have been printed widely in American newspapers and magazines.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the

Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. I apologize for not having intervened immediately following the question of the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I wish to ask another question of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The Senator from Pennsylvania expresses satisfaction with the President's speech of last night, with the exception

that he has noted.

Does the Senator feel that the President's explanation of his policy in South Vietnam, especially relative to escalation and restraint of our military effort, reflects a change or constitutes a change from our policy, as the Senator previously understood it?

Mr. CLARK. I have difficulty answering that question categorically because this administration speaks with so many different voices from time to time that no one can be certain who is making the uncertain note on the trumpet.

I would say that since the President is the Commander in Chief and the Chief Executive of the United States his word

should be the last word.

We heard from a Member of this body that testimony has been received in the Armed Services Committee that in the foreseeable future we might well increase our forces in Vietnam from 200,000 to 600,000.

We have had some fairly strong statements from the Secretary of State. Yesterday Secretary of Defense McNamara indicated the possibility of calling

up the Reserves.

Hanson Baldwin—and if I may be mildly facetious for a moment, he is a fairly faithful exponent of Pentagon opinion—indicates that we are spread so thin that we may have to have massive troops called to the colors.

The President's statement of yesterday was helpful. I have great sympathy for the position in which he finds himself. I know he is subjected to differing views. I know that he listens carefully before he makes up his mind.

The President's speech of last night does tend to clarify matters in a most helpful way.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe it is true in this debate, to a greater degree than other debates, that words get in the way of understanding.

Mr. CLARK. One of the real problems is semantics.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct. It strikes me, and I would like to have the reaction of the Senator, that the principal concern that resulted in that surge of alarm and present debate on Vietnam policy is not attributable so much to our ability to manage a war in South Vietnam, as such, as the fear that what we do there may or may not trigger a direct Red Chinese intervention which would lead to an Asian war. Is this the impression of the Senator?

Mr. CLARK. I am afraid that I could not agree with that. I do agree that the concern over getting into a wider war with China is a real and deep one. I believe there is a similar or greater concern about our commitment in Vietnam.

. My feeling is that we should not have gotten in there, and until the Baltimore speech of last spring we did not make a serious effort to get out.

I mention again the figures which I cited before the Senator came into the Chamber. At the time of President Kennedy's assassination we had only 10,-000 American soldiers in South Vietnam. all of whom were engaged in advisory missions. Now, we have over 200,000 troops there.

The answer given is that South Vietnam might have been overrun by the Vietcong if we had not done that. Then, I say, was the game worth the candle? I doubt it.

I say further to my friend from Maine that the inevitable result of escalation from 10,000 men to 200,000 men is an increase in the rate of American casualties in a cause which I cannot convince myself is essential to our national security or the defense of our national

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand, of course, that there may be differences of opinion, although not to the extent that there might have been a few years ago, as to whether we should have been involved in the first place. If we were to debate that question today, in terms of the situation when we first became involved in South Vietnam, I suspect that there might be quite a broad consensus as to what our policy is today.

Mr. CLARK. As to what our policy should have been.

Mr. MUSKIE. As to what our policy should have been. As of today, I still feel-and I am merely conveying to the Senator my view—that the great concern that grips the country so obviously and clearly today is not related to any doubts as to our ability, eventually, to get out of South Vietnam-if our problem were confined to South Vietnam-with honor and still to leave the situation subject to the control of indigenous elements in Vietnam. I think we could manage this. But my concern is that the means we may have to use in order to achieve that objective may at some point trigger a larger war. This is where my concern focuses, whatever the questions I might have had earlier, about our involvement in Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. I share the Senator's concern deeply.

The Senator said something a moment ago about the problem we have about words. I agree with him. What do we mean by "getting out of Vietnam with honor"? What is honor? The Senator and I could discuss that for a long time without coming to any obvious solution.

Mr. MUSKIE. We get some light thrown on that question-at least, I dowhen we realize that there are few in this body, or in Congress as a whole or in the country as a whole, who defend unconditional, unilateral withdrawal from Viet-

Mr. CLARK. I do not think there is anybody who does.

Mr. MUSKIE. So, at least, honor means that we must get something out of our withdrawal that will serve the national elements, the freedom elements, and the independence elements in South Vietnam

Mr. CLARK. Let me pose a question to the Senator: Does the Senator believe that we could negotiate with the Vietcong and still get out of Vietnam with honor? Would that be an honorable thing to do in the light of the terror and the murders of the Vietcong, and their determination to install a Communist regime? Can we tie up our ideas of honor with negotiation with the one people who are fighting with us?

Mr. MUSKIE. The role that the Vietcong would play at the conference table, if we were to get that far, is a sticky problem. If we gave the Vietcong too large a role before we negotiated, we might hamper the ability of whatever government emerged in South Vietnam to develop viability, independence, and the ability to decide its own country's destiny.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with that. Mr. MUSKIE. So we are concerned about that. Second, we are not really sure-and this has been the point of great debate in the Senate and throughout the country-as to what the Vietcong will do in South Vietnam. To what extent is the Vietcong wholly the agent of North Vietnam? To what extent is the Vietcong made up of indigenous elements in South Vietnam who would truly like to play a role in the destiny of their own country?

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me that there are both kinds. It is fairly obvious, despite the view of Secretary Rusk to the contrary, that a large part of the Vietcong are indigenous South Vietnamese, sincerely, although mistakenly, believing they are fighting for the freedom of their own country, which they think includes North Vietnam-and it used to-in order to repel the white invader from their shores.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator would agree, would he not, that this is a point on which we cannot be enlightened under conditions of war?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. Mr. MUSKIE. It is not possible to conduct a Gallup poll to establish that point to our satisfaction. This is why I believe there is some reservation on the part of our policymaking leaders in determining the role the Vietcong ought to play, first at the conference table, and then in the subsequent Government of South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. If we are ever going to have the shooting stop, that is a problem we shall have to face up to. Even though our policymakers may not be willing to disclose their hand, they will have to think the problem through and determine whether they are going to demand unconditional surrender by the Vietcong or will sit down and talk with them.

Mr. MUSKIE. From my point of view, we would be in a better position to refine our policy on that score if we were to get some kind of response from the other

Mr. CLARK. I could not agree more. Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for this exchange.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator vield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have found the discussion very interesting, indeed. Was not the first government of France, following the end of World War II, a coalition government?

Mr. CLARK. It was called a popular front, and my recollection is that the Prime Minister was a Socialist, Mr. Blum.

Mr. GORE. Did not, in his previous term, General de Gaulle head a coalition government?

Mr. CLARK. He did. Actually, he had a good deal of trouble in preventing the Communists from taking over that government at the time he first went back into Paris.

Mr. GORE. If the Vietcong is the principal element of our adversary in South Vietnam, would it be possible, in order to get a negotiated settlement, to ignore a principal element of opposition?

Mr. CLARK. I do not see how it would. This is where I find myself, unfortunately, in strong disagreement with the Secretary of State, who takes what I consider to be the oversimplified view that the Vietcong is merely an arm of the North Vietnamese Government, and that we do not have to deal with them directly; that we have to deal only with Hanoi and perhaps with Peiping. To me, that is utterly unrealistic.

Mr. GORE. Does the Vietcong constitute some 80 percent of the fighting force in South Vietnam?

Mr. CLARK. Of the fighting force against us.

Mr. GORE. Of the fighting force against us

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that while there are several regiments, perhaps as much as one division, of North Vietnamese troops fighting us, the Senator's statistics are correct.

Mr. GORE. Is the Vietcong a force that is indigenous to South Vietnam?

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that it is. The Vietcong have established diplomatic posts abroad in various capitals. I am not aware as to who their leaders in South Vietnam are; but there is not a shadow of a doubt, in my mind, that many Vietcong are indigenous South Vietnamese who just do not like what they consider to be the tyrannical and totalitarian government of General Ky.

Mr. GORE. Has there been a coalition government in Italy in recent years?

Mr. CLARK. Yes: but I do not believe Communists have participated in The same has been true of recent governments in France. The Senator may recall that the Communist Party

is the largest party in Italy and the second largest in France.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation that bears upon that point?

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield to permit me to make one further ob-

servation?

Mr. CLARK. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee, then I shall yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. GORE. Following up these questions, will it not be acknowledged that there are dangers in coalition governments if a part of the coalition is a Communist force?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, history shows very clearly that that is so.

Mr. GORE. But history is not unani-

mous in that regard, is it?

Mr. CLARK, No; but I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that very dangerous coalition governments which were set up initially in certain countries in Europe contained Communists who succeeded in getting hold of ministries of the interior. Czechoslovakia is a good example

Mr. GORE Whenever Communists in a coalition government have succeeded in obtaining control of the ministries of propaganda and police, and perhaps the ministry of defense—but at least the former two-that has proved to be almost without exception, so far as I recall, a coalition fatal to freedom.

If on the other hand, the head of the government succeeds, as I believe did the head of the French coalition, in giving to the communistic element within the government, welfare, social security, or some ministry that does not give them control of a vital ministry, or public information, propaganda, police, or military authority, then it has not proven fatal.

I am not so concerned about who the parties to a negotiation may be. As I understand, President Johnson has said that there will be no insurmountable problem so far as this is concerned. I believe the President is maintaining commendable flexibility in this regard.

The structure of the government that may follow the cease-fire negotiation is, in my opinion, very important.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does not the Senator agree that there are two quite different things involved here? First, who does one talk to in order to arrange a cease-fire and establish a truce? Second, what will the composition of the interim government be while an attempt is being made to hold free elections? The questions are not the same at all.

Mr. GORE. I agree. Free elections in the circumstances that prevail in Vietnam is another subject. However, lest I delay the thoughtful intervention of the Senator from Maine, I desist.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator is correct in distinguishing between whom we talk to and the composition of the government. However, the question of whom we talk to must be subdivided. It depends on the role we are willing to accept for the

Vietcong in the conference. If we accept them merely as a participant in the war, entitled to a place at the conference table and entitled to engage in the discussion, I believe that would create very little difficulty. However, if we are asked, as the North Vietnamese have insisted. to consider them to be representative of South Vietnam at the conference table, that is another extreme.

There is a sticky situation somewhere in between

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Maine to another solution. One solution might be that neither we nor the Chinese Communists go to the conference table, but that the Vietnamese people settle their problem for themselves. That may be the best way to do it, but it might not be practical.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, February 21, 1966, there appeared an article by Ferenc Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary.

The Senator may have seen this article.

Mr. CLARK. I did not.

Mr. MUSKIE. In this article Mr. Nagy said:

As far as I know I am the only former political leader in exile in America who was the head of a coalition government in Central Eastern Europe after World War II.

On the basis of my experiences in my own country and observations in the whole central and Eastern European area I would like to comment on Senator Robert Kennedy's proposition of a coalition government for South Vietnam.

In an aside, I suggest that the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has since refined his position on those points. However, at the time the article was written, he had not.

I continue to read from Mr. Nagy's article:

The first thing to know is that if a coalition in an ideologically troubled country is established with the assistance of outside power or powers, then the strength and endurance of the participating political parties or groups is not dependent at all on domestic popular support but on the help of the outside great powers which are behind them politically.

In my government the Communist Party had only 17 percent of popular support while my party alone was supported by more than 60 percent of the voters and the Parliament. Still the Communist Party could get in power in 2 years because they were supported by the Soviet Union and I was overthrown because no outside power gave me

I believe this is a very interesting and useful illustration of the problem of a coalition government.

Mr. CLARK. I believe that it is, too. I have many serious doubts about whether a coalition government could be successful in South Vietnam. However. I point out that the situation which existed in Eastern Europe is really entirely different from the situation in South Vietnam at the moment. We had no American presence in Hungary. have a big American presence in Vietnam, a much bigger American presence than Red China has.

The need for leaving the President great flexibility is clear. There are all kinds of possibilities; it might be feasible to have a coalition government of the sort suggested by the Senator from Tennessee, and not unlike the one we now have in Laos. With the existing power concentration, and the American physical presence, it would not be nearly so dangerous as the situation which existed in Hungary when we were a long wayoff

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, what we are discussing is the integrity of a coalition government after the American presence is withdrawn. This is the problem which we are discussing.

Mr. CLARK. I would not for a minute advocate a withdrawal of the American presence until after a free election had determined the composition of government that the people of South Vietnam wanted, and whether it was to be independent, a federation or, indeed, a unified government with North Vietnam.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in connection with the exchange that has just occurred, does not the Senator from Pennsylvania feel that there might quite properly develop a role for the United Nations or some other specially established international commission, that could have governing significance in the interim period so that, pending elections, we might be certain that no single element in South Vietnam could come to dominate. In other words, does not the Senator from Pennsylvania see the possibility of a role developing for the United Nations which might even substitute for a time for a local government in preserving the requisite order and in supervising the conduct of the requisite elections, on which an indigenous government could thereafter be formed?

Mr. CLARK. I should hope so. But. frankly, although I was gratified by our decision to go to the United Nations with the Vietnamese problem, we must remember that our adversaries are not members of the United Nations. If we were to have a cease-fire, both parties would have to agree. If we were to have international machinery to supervise an election, both parties would have to agree.

I should be somewhat skeptical as to whether Hanoi-or Peiping, if they were to inject themselves into the situation, as they well might-would be willing to turn the conduct of an election over to a United Nations team.

It occurs to me that a far more hopeful course would be to go back to the Geneva Conference or, in the alternative, to the International Control Commission. consisting of, I believe, India, Canada, and Poland, as the international agency for supervision.

Mr. CHURCH. That might be the kind of international commission that in the end would emerge, but I do think that an article which appeared in a recent edition of the Nation magazine, captioned, "The Tactics of a Truce," written by Jack D. Forbes, is worthy of the consideration of the Senate.

It envisions a supervisory role by the United Nations, though the article could be read in such a way as to substitute some other suitable international commission for the United Nations wherever

that term appears.

Since the article specifies steps that might be taken toward a satisfactory truce, and ultimately toward self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, and since it is, in spirit, an article that conforms to the character and thrust of the excellent address that the Senator from Pennsylvania is giving this afternoon, I wonder if the Senator would mind if I asked unanimous consent to have the article published in the RECORD at a point following the conclusion of the Senator's remarks?

Mr. CLARK. I should be very happy

to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, there have been several references to Eastern Europe, and particularly to Czechoslovakia. I suppose I have probably had more nuts-and-bolts experience there than any other Senator, because I was in charge of the consulate general in Slovakia at the time of the Communist putsch in 1948.

I remember at that time, or a few months earlier, thinking that this putsch would occur, because an election was about to be held, and one knew that the Communists could not afford the results of an election, because they would have

lost ground.

One also knew that when Jan Masaryk indicated that he would like to join the Marshall plan, that would be strong medicine for the Soviets, their immediate

neighbors to the east.

So I remember, about 6 weeks before the putsch, I predicted that there would be a putsch, because the Communists could not accept a loss of power through election, which would be the inevitable

The powers that be above me in the State Department chain of command did not agree, and thought that the election could be held and all would work itself out. Lo and behold, when the time came, the Communists preferred the putsch to waiting for and abiding by an election.

The governing factor here is whether or not a strong presence would remain to enforce election results. If that presence were there to enforce the elections, one would not worry too much about the results of the election.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will permit an interjection, I would worry very much about them.

Mr. PELL. The Senator is probably more experienced in the Far East. I know he was in the Far East in the war. But from my experience in eastern Europe, in most of the countries there, the public will did not seem to go in the Communist direction when there was a truly free election.

Mr. CLARK. I merely point out that if for 11 years you support a totalitarian

government, and then you go in with B-52 bombers and heavy artillery and small arms and shoot up the villages; and the other side does the same thing. with terroristic tactics. I think it is a pretty close question who the poor people are going to vote for if they once get a chance to vote.

Mr. President, I return to the subject I was discussing before this most interesting colloquy, and I thank my colleagues for their intervention. That was the question of why we cannot get an accurate map out of either the State Department, or the Defense Department, which will show the territory either controlled by the Vietcong or contested by them.

I was pointing out that they give us classified maps, small in scale, which purport to show some of this information, but then tell us we cannot use them to alert the American people to the sitnation.

We have seen many of these maps in news magazines and in the daily newspapers, but when I called one of them to the attention of Mr. David Bell in open session the other day before the Foreign Relations Committee, he said the map I was showing him was not accurate, and that he would give me an accurate map.

but I could not use it.

I hope that when Secretary McNamara comes before the Foreign Relations Committee next week, he will be prepared to bring with him a meaningful map, and I would hope it would be unclassified. But even if he insists on classifying it, on the ground that this might give aid and comfort to the enemy because it would show them that we know where they are, at least he might let us have a classified map, so some of us on the committee can have some real understanding of what the military situation in Vietnam is with respect to the holding of real estate. If you do not hold the real estate, how can you go through with a social and economic program that is anything more than a rescue operation for refugees and the dwellers in a few overcrowded cities?

Mr. MUSKIE. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Simply for clarification. As the Senator knows, like many Members of Congress, this year, I spent some time in Vietnam. While there, we pressed for some enlightenment on the very point the Senator is discussing; in other words, to give us as accurate and precise a pictorial impression as possible as regards the state of control of real

We were told over and over again that although we could be given something that might approximate the situation at a given instant of time, the nature of the war there is so fluid that almost any map that might be offered would in a sense be misleading as to what the situation is at the moment the beholder might be looking at it.

So when we were given maps, we were asked to withhold them, for the reason that they might be misleading at such time as we released them.

This may be too great a sensitivity on this point. I think the Senator is right in raising it, but I simply wished to state what we learned when we were there. and match it against what the Senator has been told.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his information. I have been told exact-

ly the same thing.

Perhaps I am dealing more in logic than in common sense, but I do not see why one cannot draw a map which says, "We hold this particular province so firmly that we can go in there and build a school building, or a rural electrification plant, give fertilizer to the peasants, help them harvest their crops, and nobody is going to change it; that is our backyard. Here is another area where the control of the province changes back and forth; perhaps the Vietcong control it at night, we control it in the daytime.'

We had an interesting example the other day of what happens when we build these schools. Sometimes the Vietcong burn them down, if they are built by the Saigon government. If the local people participate in building them, the Vietcong do not burn them down: they use them for evening meetings, at which they teach the children to sing Vietcong songs. Sometimes they use them as sanctuaries, because when there is an attack on a particular hamlet, they are pretty sure our troops or the South Vietnamese will not attack the little red schoolhouses. Then, as soon as the attack is over, they open fire from the schoolhouses.

Maps would also show that there are other areas which are all jungle and elephant grass, and are virtually unin-

habited.

That kind of map, I think, considering our position in having to determine how much to vote in the way of social and economic aid for South Vietnam, is an important source of information to which I think we are entitled.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yet there is no way of determining whether an area identified as a secure area on the map is indeed secure, or controlled to the point where we cannot suffer damage. For example. Saigon itself is a secure area, but there is terrorism going on there all the time. When we were there, a hotel housing American servicemen blown up.

Mr. CLARK. There is a strong school of thought-I believe this was mentioned in the Mansfield report—that Saigon is a

hostage for Hanoi, and vice versa.

Mr. MUSKIE. There is a school of thought to that effect. My own feeling is that the reason the Vietcong do not move in on Saigon with greater force is that they are not in a position to do so. not because of any inhibitions tied to the protection of Hanoi. I doubt very much that they consider them mutual hostages, but I understand there is that view held by many people on our side.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to

the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, more or less attention is being directed to the problem of the Vietcong. Indeed, that seems to be the principal problem.

Now, should our goal be similar to intimations the Senator and I heard earlier today, suggesting the extermination

of the Vietcong?

Mr. CLARK. I believe that is a hopeless objective. I do not believe we can ever do it. They can quit, of course. But I saw in the newspapers the other day that we have shot off 25,000 bullets for every Vietcong we have killed. That is not an effective method of warfare, in my opinion.

Mr. GORE. Just what is to be done, then, if the Vietcong are not to be admitted to negotiations, are not to have a part in the government, are not to be permitted to exist? What kind of war is this? What kind of war would it be necessary to wage to achieve the goal of extermination of the Vietcong in South Vietnam?

Mr. CLARK. I can see no other course but to demand unconditional surrender, which I deplore as being neither wise nor feasible. This is a problem which

the administration must face.

Mr. GORE. In asking these questions, please understand that I have no fixed conclusions as to how the problem of Vietcong insurgency in South Vietnam should be handled. I doubt whether those who wish merely to ignore it, or to exterminate them, realize the extent of the areas hold, according to such maps as the Senator and I have been privileged to see; and I doubt whether the problem is quite so simple as that. No attempt was made to exterminate the Communists in France after World War II because of their political affiliations. No attempt was made to exterminate Communist sympathizers in Laos before this settlement was reached.

I raise these questions only for contemplation, not to make an assertion myself as to how it should be done; but, it seems to me, that some of the sentiments which the Senator and I and others have been hearing recently are certainly unrealistic and not quite relative to the problem that prevails in South

Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator; yet, in all candor, one has to give some thought to the analogy in Malaya after the war where, for 7 years, the British and the Malayans fought against the infiltration of Chinese Communists and, finally, exterminated them or persuaded them that they had so little chance to succeed that they returned to China.

We know of the present efforts of the Belaunde government in Peru to exterminate the Communists in the Andes. They seem to be doing rather well. The Betancourt government in Venezuela has been successful recently in exterminating the Communist minority. Therefore, I agree fundamentally with the Senator since I do not believe that we can do this in South Vietnam. We must examine these analogies with great care.

Mr. GORE. The disturbing problem—which I believe it truly to be—is that apparently some of our colleagues have easy and simple solutions to exterminate the Vietcong. I do not believe that is quite so easy as some appear to think it to be.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, a few final thoughts about the maps. In my judgment, these maps are substantially accurate. They maps are substantially accurate. show, as stated above, that most of the food producing area in South Vietnam and, indeed, most of the villages and hamlets are either completely under control of the Vietcong or so subject to raids which requisition the crops or, in the alternative, collect heavy taxes as a condition to permitting the peasants to harvest them, that South Vietnam, once a rice exporting country, is now importing at heavy cost a substantial part of its food supply. Moreover, the writ of the Saigon government runs feebly, if at all, to the overwhelming majority of the areas where the peasants live and cultivate their fields.

Nor do the present military tactics pursued by the American troops hold

much prospect of success.

Mr. President, here one must be cautious, because I do not purport to be a military expert. A few moments ago, one or two of our colleagues congratulated themselves on having served with distinction in the Armed Forces of our country during World War II. Many of us served. I do not believe that makes any of us a military expert. However, as legislators, charged with the responsibility for voting authorization of funds for a war so far away from our shores, we have a duty, at least as civilians, to look at the facts. In my opinion, the searchand-destroy tactics are not a sound and feasible way to win the war.

Indeed, as Walter Lippmann has well said, these tactics are much like punching water. The "search and destroy" policy of killing Vietcong and North Vietnamese soldiers is a sterile one. The end result is an unnecessary increase in American casualties without any real countervailing advantage. Moreover it requires the investment of a fortune in terms of equipment and ammunition expended in bombing raids, amphibious expeditions, and the direction of our enormous firepower into the elephant grass and the jungles in efforts, often fruitless, to find and kill the enemy. In all too many cases, the enemy slips out of the traps we so elaborately lay for them. And once a contested area has been secured by American might, it is only a short time before our troops withdraw and the Vietcong come right back into the area where the battle took place.

In the course of all this, hundreds, if not thousands, of innocent women and children, as well as South Vietnamese farmers, are killed or rendered homeless. Surely this policy is certain to lose the hearts and minds of the very individuals we are trying to get on our side.

A good example of this was the recent highly publicized American offensive in Binh Dinh and Quang Ngai provinces. These provinces are densely inhabited, rich in rice, and have been largely under Communist control for the last year and a half. The major offensive against them was aimed at four North Vietnamese regiments which, with minor ex-

ceptions, refused to stand and fight. Having failed to corner the enemy, but having killed an unknown number of civilians, the Americans are now withdrawing, leaving devastation, destruction, and curses, not loud but deep, behind them.

One may ask concerning this "search and destroy" policy: How many Vietcong must we kill to persuade them to give up? How many Americans must die in the effort? How many South Vietnamese must also die, including innocent men, women, and children not engaged in the battle? What will the country look like after the engagements are over? Is this the way to secure the loyalty of the local population? And can we hold the real estate we reconquer in the course of the search and destroy offensives?

Additional unanswered questions, of course are: Cannot the Vietcong with Hanoi's support continue guerrilla warfare indefinitely, gradually, with our unwilling collaboration, bringing about the destruction of the economy and the countryside of South Vietnam? Perhaps more important, how much treasure and manpower, in the light of our other global commitments, will the military request from the White House in order to keep this kind of unrewarding warfare going?

A word about the political, economic, and social situation in South Vietnam. Ever since the French departed 11 years ago, we have been urging a series of frequently changing South Vietnamese Governments to establish a free democratic society in that part of their country not under Vietcong control. Several abortive efforts to achieve this result were, in truth, made, but every one of them has failed. Now it appears from the Honolulu Conference that still another effort will be attempted. totalitarian Ky government has com-mitted itself to reforming its habits and customs and installing social, economic, and political justice in the countryside under its control.

Yet dispatches from South Vietnam make clear that there is little opportunity for the average South Vietnamese peasant to participate in any significant way in the Government of his own country or, indeed, to rise in the ranks of that Government. Educational requirements and an inbred autocratic oligarchical society, confine positions of honor and good pay to the military, the civil servants, and the families of the landlords who still control the overwhelming proportion of the real estate in areas in which the writ of the Ky government still runs. Moreover, the age-long quarrels between Catholics, Buddhists, the various other religious sects, and long-standing jealousy between families originating in South Vietnam towards families from the north create a complicated social picture which gives little opportunity for a democratic solution in freedom. Over and above all these, Ho Chi Minh is still the father figure to most of the Vietnamese, North and South, who think in national terms. There is no comparable individual around whom the South Vietnamese can rally.

A good example of the difficulties confronting the efforts to bring social justice to South Vietnam appears in the New York Times for Monday, February 21, in an article by Charles Mohr under the headline "Saigon Social Ills Worry U.S. Aids." The heart of the article appears in the first two paragraphs, which read as follows:

Many of the Americans who work in the South Vietnamese countryside believe that nothing short of major changes in the country's social system and in the performance of the Government can ever produce the political conditions necessary for victory over the Vietcong.

They hope desperately—but skeptically—that Vice President Humphrey was right when he said with exuberance in Saigon recently that it was "our side," not the Vietcong, that would make a true social revolution in South Vietnam.

The article then points out the typical difficulties which arise in Kienhoa Province in the Mekong River Delta where, despite earnest efforts of American and South Vietnamese officials, there seems little hope that the 1966 pacification plan can succeed. In this area the Government controls only 30 percent of the terrain and a little more than a third of the population. Despite the B-52 bombings and wide military operations against them, the Vietcong guerrillas have tightened their hold on the countryside. As one American official was quoted as saying:

The truth is, we are not offering these people any very good reason to switch sides.

Both because we and our South Vietnamese allies hold so little of the real estate, and because the whole social, economic, and political system in South Vietnam requires a drastic revision, almost impossible to accomplish in less than a generation, I have little confidence that our aid program will be any more successful in the future than it has been in the past.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. If the Senator would prefer to complete his remarks without my interrupting them, I would be pleased to withhold my request.

Mr. CLARK. No. The speech has been chopped up already.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am sorry another commitment will prevent my hearing all of the Senator's speech, but I have read most of the statement that he is making today. I think it is one of the most thoughtful and constructive statements yet offered on the Vietnam crisis. I hope very much that it will be carefully read by our officials in the State Department and the executive branch.

Mr. CLARK. I hope so, too, I may say to my friend, but I have some doubts about it.

Mr. McGOVERN. I know the Senator is highly regarded in the Government. I suspect that what he has to say is very carefully read, although not always followed as fully as it should be.

I share the Senator's conviction that the President of the United States very much wants to achieve a negotiated settlement of this conflict. I have never for one moment doubted the President's very real desire to achieve a peaceful and honorable settlement of this conflict. I think perhaps more than any one of us, he is concerned about the bloodshed and the sacrifice of American lives in that part of the world, and that he has a very strong and clear desire to move the conflict from the battlefield to the negotiating table.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator.
Mr. McGOVERN. I have thought
about what prevents the other side from
accepting the invitation to negotiations
and it seems to me there may be at least
three factors that explain this unfortunate situation.

I think the first factor has been the reluctance of the administration to state clearly that it is willing to enter into direct negotiations with the National Liberation Front.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, while it is an unpleasant fact, that political group nevertheless controls a major portion of the countryside. It is an effective political and military force in South Vietnam. It is the force that has been shooting and killing the Government troops in South Vietnam. It is the force that has been shooting at our own men there. So, unpleasant as it may be, they represent a power to be dealt with and not merely as an appendage to Hanoi.

Second, I think we must state our willingness to permit that front some share in whatever provisional government is established. The Saigon government has, of course, a voice in this matter too as do other interested groups. But we must indicate our willingness to have the National Liberation Front involved in any kind of provisional government that is established before elections are held:

The third factor that I think stands in the way of negotiations is that every time we have expressed a desire for negotiations, we have stepped up the military operations. There have been more search and destroy operations, or more bombing attacks. Those offensive activities are doubtless interpreted by the other side as an indication of lack of good faith on our side to negotiate. We should be able to understand that, because various officials in our own Government have said that the other side did not seem to be interested in negotiations when they have accelerated their military activities.

I wonder if the Senator agrees with me that these three factors are pertinent. There may be others, but are they not factors which make the other side reluctant to enter negotiations?

Mr. CLARK. I agree. We cannot expect the other side to come to the negotiating table while we are engaging in military attacks.

There is an additional factor involved, which I think is important, and I wonder if the Senator will agree with me. The other side still thinks it is going to win. I have been accused of being a dove, and in some respects I am. I do not think we can permit them to think we are tired. I think we must stay to convince them that we mean what we say. I do think we should try to minimize the

casualties. But we must remember that they think they are going to win, that we are not going to win, that we will get tired and that we will get out.

I would like to point out for the RECORD that there is not a single U.S. Senator who wants us to get out of Vietnam unilaterally.

Mr. McGOVERN. I have never recommended U.S. withdrawal before an honorable settlement and I know of no other Senator who has

I do not believe either side can win a military victory. The cost of a clear-cut victory on either side is so high that it is beyond any interest that either they or we might have. This is not a war in which military victory is feasible for either side.

We have enough firepower in Vietnam so that we are not going to be pushed out. By the same token if we were to use that firepower to try to score what some call a victory, we would have to kill 3, 4, or 5 times as many innocent civilians as the number of guerrillas that would be killed.

We have reached what amounts to a military stalemate in the war, and that leaves no reasonable alternative other than a negotiated settlement.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from South Dakota not agree that the President expressed the point very well yesterday in New York, and that what he said there is applicable to us as well as to the other side? I quote the President:

We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched with caution in deed.

Mr. McGOVERN. I believe that is an excellent point. It is a more eloquent way of stating that old rhyme we used to state in childhood:

Sticks and stones will break my bones but names will never hurt me.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. Mr. McGOVERN. Many times the words, particularly those of the Chinese, are phrased in much more belligerent terms than their actions.

Mr. CLARK. I agree.

 Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator on his excellent address.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his intervention.

Mr. President, I wish to speak for a moment about American capability. If we go for all-out war we could, of course, with our enormous firepower and the interjection of several hundred thousand additional American ground troops, together with a stepping up of our bombing in the south, wipe out the Vietcong; but we would wipe out South Vietnam with it and earn the undying enmity of those still living after the assaults had terminated.

We could also destroy the economy of North Vietnam and kill a good part of its population in order to induce surrender.

If China were to come in as a result of all this, we could win a war against China.

In short, to paraphrase the words of the well-known poem, it would be indeed a famous victory. But what would be left afterward?

None but madmen would advocate such a solution. There are limitations on the cost we can pay for total victory. As a civilized nation, there must be some limit to the number of people we are willing to kill and the amount of havoc we are prepared to wreak on a fundamentally innocent and, until recently, friendly people. There are limitations on our war capabilities in South Vietnam even short of a war with China. Among them, and they are important indeed, are, first, the number of American coffins our administration is prepared to see come home while the war is escalated and, second, the cost in terms of moving forward with our Great Society program, redressing the balance of our international payments, maintaining our friendly posture with the other nations of the world and, indeed, our own self-respect.

In the light of the foregoing, what should be American policy? Our present Vietnamese policy has: First, alienated most of our allies; second, impeded the conduct of our overall foreign policy; third, spread American military power too thin for our own safety; fourth, set back, for the foreseeable future, any prospect of a detente with Russia; fifth, set back the pacification of China and the bringing of that country into the family of nations; and, sixth, seriously damaged our hopes for arms control and

disarmament.

On the domestic front, the costs of an expanded war will mean abandonment of the Great Society program or, in the alternative, a substantial increase in Federal taxes. Our problems in balancing our international payments have been substantially increased. So has the threat of inflation. There is a danger that measures may shortly have to be taken to combat inflation which could bring an end to the 5 consecutive years of prosperity the country has enjoyed.

And perhaps the most frustrating part of the unhappy position in which we find ourselves is that no one can be sure whether our present policy may not succeed before we realize it. It is entirely conceivable that the Vietcong, with the acquiescence of Hanoi and Peiping, may give up tomorrow. Yet I, for one, am unwilling to see us put all our chips on that possibility. It is true that our opponents are not 10 feet tall. It is true that they have grave weaknesses. But it is equally true that the creeping escalation into which our country has been sucked holds grave dangers for all Americans if it is further pursued. The time has come for us to draw up a balance sheet, and look at the advantages of further escalation, if there are any, as against the costs.

Before presenting my own view, I should like to say a word about the function of the Senate. There are Members of this body and many outside, both in and out of the administration, who believe that Senators should remain silent in the face of these critical problems lest by speaking out we give aid and comfort to the enemies of our country. But to me this is a primitive and wholly unacceptable view. In our pluralistic and demo-eratic society the right of dissent is se-Under our Constitution the Senate is required to give its advice and

consent in matters of foreign policy. In my judgment, both the current hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee and the debate now going on on the floor of the Senate provide an important national service. In fact, I believe it my duty, as well as that of other Senators, to speak out on the subject of Vietnam.

Already the debate has accomplished much. We have forced the administration to carry out an "agonizing reap-praisal," to borrow an old phrase, of its basic assumptions about our involvement in Vietnam. We have helped to sharpen the issues for the American people. We have pinpointed the dangers of following the belligerent course advocated by some administration leaders as well as some highly respected Senators. And in the end I hope we shall be successful in shaping a new course of action which will produce an honorable negotiated settlement.

What, then, should our course be? I conclude:

First. Viewing Vietnam in the light of our global commitments and our national capabilities, the military realities are such that the cost in casualties and money of further escalating the war in order to crush the enemy, to retake lost real estate and to pacify the country are too high to be acceptable.

Second. More and bigger bombing or a substantial buildup of American ground forces cannot change the military realities in our favor without unacceptable casualties and the expenditure of billions of dollars badly needed elsewhere. The forces arrayed against us can be increased indefinitely. The notion that we can achieve a decisive military superiority in South Vietnam is a dangerous fantasy because the adversary land powers of Asia, with substantially greater military manpower, will not permit us to do so except at the cost of entirely destroying the country and leaving nothing but devastation and ruin as the result of our efforts.

Third. The real problem is to achieve a settlement consistent with the military realities. While efforts are going forward at the United Nations and elsewhere to bring the shooting to an end. we should stay where we are in South Vietnam with what we have in terms of naval, air, and land power. We should increase our forces, our armaments, and our financial commitment only to the extent necessary to maintain our present position. We should require that the major burden of any effort to retake enemy-held territory should fall on the South Vietnamese, not on us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is probably going to say it; therefore, I may be intervening unnecessarily. As the Senator knows, I have not listened to all of his speech, but he has favored me with the text of it, and I find myself in general accord with it. I am proud to tell him this because he and I have agreed on major objectives. We have had variances of opinion as to how to implement the objectives we have in mind.

The Senator's descendants will have every reason to be proud of the record he is leaving behind today in his speech in this historic debate. In my judgment, it is a magnificent speech.

I am proud to be associated with the Senator in the advancement of some of our reasons for urging some modification of our Government's policy.

When the Senator makes the suggestions that he started to make as to what our policy ought to be, this does not mean that we are in any way going to risk our position in South Vietnam militarily. It does not mean that we are going to jeopardize the welfare of our boys over there. I think it means that we are going to save the lives of many of them who otherwise would be killed.

So far as I am concerned, I am proud to say that I wholeheartedly support General Gavin and his definition of an enclave program in South Vietnam. I strongly urge my Government to accept

that program.

But the point I want to make is that we now hold this position, which means that the Vietcong cannot takeover. It means they cannot succeed in advancing. Many people get the idea that the enclave theory means some kind of retreat or some kind of surrender. That is pure nonsense. It does mean that in the holding operation we, I think, strengthen the possibility of other nations moving in with an entirely different status and for an entirely different purpose—the purpose of peacekeeping; the purpose of trying to work out a cease-fire; the purpose of trying to work out a negotiated settlement, not to be carried on under a bilateral arrangement between the United States and South Vietnam, on the one hand, and the Vietcong and North Vietnam, on the other; but with noncombatants sitting at the head of the table, leading the parties to an honorable and negotiated settlement. That must be the approach.

I shall stop now. The Senator has heard me say this many times. We have to play for that period of time when we can get multilateral participation in a settlement of this problem. It cannot be done, in my judgment, under the program that our administration has out-

lined.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from Oregon and thank him for his helpful intervention.

I return to a discussion of my third point, which is what our course should be for the future. I had started to say that the real problem is to achieve a settlement consistent with the military realities.

I believe that from our present military position we should give our military commanders complete flexibility to utilize their present forces to the maximum extent consistent with an acceptable rate of casualties; and, in my judgment, such an acceptable rate would be very low indeed.

Fifth. In our search for a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement we must be prepared to deal at the conference table with the Vietcong.

I think it is generally agreed that our goal in Vietnam should not be unconditional surrender by our opponents. The President has stressed, over and over again, that our aim is an honorable

peace, not total victory.

But by pretending that the Vietcong do not exist—except as a sort of North Vietnamese expenditionary force—we are, in effect, demanding their unconditional surrender.

True, we are not seeking total victory over North Vietnam. It is not our aim to invade North Vietnam and occupy Hanoi. But this does not change the situation in the south.

It is absurd to contend, as the North Vietnamese do, that the National Liberation Front is the "sole" representative of the people of South Vietnam. In order to make that assertion a fact, the Vietcong and their allies from the north would have to achieve a total victory over the Saigon government. This we can never permit, either on the battlefield or at the conference table.

But if our position is that the Saigon government is the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people, then our objective must be that the Vietcong lay down their arms and submit to the Saigon government—in other words, total victory for General Ky. There is a difference between negotiating a compromise settlement which is not fully acceptable to either side, but not unacceptable to either side, and simply negotiating about where the Vietcong are to stack their arms before heading to the prison camp. The first type properly deserves to be called a negotiation; the second sort is not negotiation at all—it is simply settling the details on an unconditional surrender. And obviously nobody would agree to a so-called negotiation of the latter sort unless they were thoroughly heaten

The one salient point in the Mansfield report—in which I understand there is general agreement—is that this is an "open ended" war. In other words, if our goal is to defeat the Vietcong to the extent that they are willing to come to a conference merely to settle the terms of their surrender, then we are in for a much larger war, because the other side can match us man for man into the hundreds of thousands, even without Chinese intervention. I hope we all appreciate the dangers of a war with China—and perhaps ultimately with Russia—if this escalation should occur.

However, if our goal is a genuine negotiation-and not just a negotiated Vietcong surrender-then I think we should say so plainly to the other side. Of course, we should not reveal our minimum bargaining position; there is not much room left for bargaining if we do that. But we should make it plain that our objective is not the unconditional surrender of the Vietcong, and the best way to do that is to make it plain that we expect them to come to the bargaining table in their own right. So long as they are under the impression that we expect them to stack arms and surrender, one could hardly expect them to take a positive view about our "peace offensive."

If we are really interested in a genuine negotiation—and not just a negotiated surrender by the Vietcong—what can we expect the negotiators to talk about?

The answer is simple—setting the conditions under which the wounds of the war can be healed and the people of South Vietnam can achieve some measure of democracy and self-determination. It is essential that we not commit ourselves to any specific formula, and that we not bar any formula which might achieve this result, because the formula is what we will be negotiating.

We should be canvassing—and I hope our State Department planners are now studying—a variety of alternatives. It is likely that some sort of provisional government will have to be set up. I think it is most important that a definite date for the holding of free elections be established, that all the negotiating parties pledge themselves to guarantee the holding of such elections-unlike the prior Geneva accords, which the United States did not sign-and that a strong international force be sent into the country to enforce a cease-fire and to assure that the election, when held, is as free as it can be made.

The International Control Commission from the 1954 accords, made up of India, Canada, and Poland, still exists; perhaps it could do the job, given a sizable increase in manpower. Perhaps a new all-Asian International Control Commission should be set up, in which countries such as Burma, Malaysia, and the Philippines might participate. This is obviously a proper subject for negotiations.

If a decision should be taken to set up a provisional government which would have the duty of governing South Vietnam until free elections under international controls are held, obviously one of the toughest jobs for the negotiators—which would have to include the Saigon Government and the Vietcong as well as North Vietnam and ourselves—will be determining the makeup of the government. Since the establishment of some kind of government is an essential precondition to the holding of free elections, there is no way of avoiding the painful job of negotiating such a provisional arrangement.

It is most vital that we not walk into the bargaining session with inflexible attitudes and firm preconditions on this point.

To my regret, I note that a really inflexible position is still held by some people high in the administration. It may be possible to work out some form of international custodial government which could run and pacify the country until the holding of elections; this might be the best way out of the dilemma.

The negotiators might favor a hybrid arrangement for a provisional government with certain key functions—such as police, information, and justice—under temporary international control, and with other functions under South Vietnamese control. Or they might come up with a plan for an all-South Vietnamese provisional government, with the International Control Commission staying in the background and merely keeping the peace and guaranteeing the freedom of the elections, including, of course, the freedom to organize for political activity and campaign for office.

I think we have a right to expect that the other side will not take an adamant position requiring the exclusion of representatives of the Saigon Government in such a provisional arrangement. But, by the same token, I think they have a right to expect that we will not prejudge their claims for NLF participation.

So far as I can determine, and I confess the recent rash of confusing statements has tended to cloud the atmosphere, this is precisely what President Johnson's position is.

While he did not deal at any depth with the subject in his speech in New York last night, yet I think everything that I have said is consistent with the position he summarized during that talk.

According to press reports I have seen, Press Secretary Moyers has expressly declared "that kind of question is one that should be decided at the negotiating table." This statement was apparently made in response to a request for comment on the proposal that the United States keep the door open to the possibility of participation by the National Liberation Front in any provisional government which may be set up as a result of peace talks before free elections are held.

As one Senator who has long supported the President's efforts to achieve an honorable negotiated settlement, I am quite frankly grateful to the White House for this much needed clarification. I hope the President will seize every opportunity to bring this message home, and help to dispel the confusion which exists both here in the United States, and in Hanoi, about our aims. For I am one of those who continue to hope that when the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese have become convinced of our desire to achieve a settlement which is honorable without being unrealistic, the negotiations for which we have sought so long can begin.

I close my remarks with the hope that the President and his principal military and civilian advisers will give prayerful thought to the point of view which I have expressed this afternoon, and will refrain from further escalating the war in what, in my judgment, would be a vain effort to achieve that most elusive of objectives, military victory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a series of editorials, columns, and comments by the editors of the New York Times, Mr. James Reston, Mr. Joseph Kraft, Mr. Walter Lippmann, and Mr. Max Frankel, from which documents I have drawn much of the inspiration for this speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have listened to the address of the Senator this afternoon with attention and with admiration. He continues to display independence of thought.

I believe that he has made a most constructive contribution to the continuing dialog on Vietnam. I commend him very strongly for the forthright and courageous address he has given this afternoon.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend for his kind words. As he knows, he and I have stood pretty much together in this matter over the last several months.

Mr. CHURCH. I especially congratulate the Senator for his determination to advance the discussion in a dispassionate way, since we are searching for light instead of heat. This is obviously the need of the moment if our country's best interests are to be served.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I understand the views of the Senator from Pennsylvania and he understands mine. However, I disagree with the views of the Senator.

I ask the Senator what his judgment is concerning the legality of the position of the United States. Is the Senator one of those who believe that this Nation at present does not have the power to put troops there, that the authorization given the President in August is not sufficiently broad to empower the President to put those troops there, or that we are in violation of our United Nations Charter and treaty commitment?

Mr. CLARK. I have mixed views about that. I really have not attempted to firm up any definitive view. This is a rather secondary matter.

I do not believe that the Tonkin Gulf resolution added a single thing to the powers that the President had as Commander in Chief.

I do not think the repeal of that resolution or its modification would take away any of the powers which he had. Yet, from a purely legalistic point of view, I believe that a very good case can be made for the position that we find ourselves in a state of war, an obvious war, without that war having been declared by Congress as the Constitution requires. But I do not want to get legalistic about it because there are very many reasons, with many of which I sympathize, why it did not seem either feasible or wise to come to Congress to request a declaration of war.

The whole character of war has changed since our Constitution was framed. When we deal with so-called wars of national liberation, subversion, and sabotage, I am not at all sure that the strict constitutional requirement—which I believe has been violated—should nonetheless prevail.

With respect to the SEATO Treaty, only recently stressed by the Secretary of State, I do not believe that we have any obligation under that treaty to commit 200,000 men to the jungles of South Vietnam. On the other hand, I agree that we have the right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am sure I agree at least in part with what the Senator has said here.

When President Eisenhower occupied the White House and John Foster Dulles was urging us to vote for a Near East or Middle East resolution, this Senator insisted that the President had the right to send troops to the Near East in the absence of any declaration by Congress.

It was the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana at that time that the necessity and wisdom of the President in sending the troops would be best declared after the event occurred, or after the provocation occurred, rather than in advance.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator could make a very good case for that, and I would not necessarily quarrel with him. However, trying to put oneself in the position of the President of the United States, one would be very reluctant to take massive military action without reassuring himself that the Congress was not going to shoot him down from behind.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We fought the Korean war that way, though, as the Senator very well knows.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; we did.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The President declared that such was our duty under the United Nations Treaty, and put troops in there, and Senator Taft of Ohio repeatedly criticized the President for not coming to Congress and seeking a resolution. We fought that war to a conclusion, such as it was, on that basis.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator.
Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There have been 125 times, at least, if not more, when Presidents have undertaken to put the Armed Forces into action, either in defense of a position or to take a position, without a declaration of war.

The Constitution says that Congress shall declare war, but it does not deny the President, as the Commander in Chief, the right to put the Armed Forces of the United States into action prior to a declaration of war.

In this case, the President of the United States, recalling the Korean situation and Senator Taft's criticism of what happened, came and asked Congress for approval of what he had done; and those of us who voted on it—that is, many of us—clearly understood the meaning of those last words, which said that he would take whatever steps were necessary to prevent further aggression.

My thought at that time, as the Senate was voting on it, was that we could expect that the North Vietnamese might react violently to our response to their attack in the Tonkin Gulf, and that if that should happen, we proposed to counter whatever they would do thereafter; and it was my belief that when we sent troops down there, the President had the necessary authorization.

The Senator, of course, is familiar with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, the so-called Vandenberg proposal, which says that nothing in the United Nations Charter would impair the right of any nation to act in individual or collective self-defense.

Inasmuch as we had a treaty, we certainly had the right to construe that treaty—as we did with the August resolution last year—as requiring us to act to meet aggression.

In view of that, it would seem to this Senator, just as it seemed to the American Bar Association by a unanimous vote—I think it was 279 to 0—that we had a treaty obligation, and we had an

act of Congress telling the President that "We think the treaty obligation is involved here, we have been attacked, we have struck back, we have anticipated further aggression," and we authorized the President to take whatever steps he deemed necessary to meet further aggression.

While I appreciate the Senator's argument, in the last analysis, it would seem to me that it would be the President, in compliance with that resolution, who would determine what he thought was necessary to meet that aggression, not the Congress, because the resolution explicitly states he should take the steps he thought necessary to meet the aggression.

Mr. CLARK. I do not wish to become involved in an argument with the Senator from Louisiana, because I think he can make a pretty good legal argument; in fact, he has just done so. I know that my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] does not agree with him, and perhaps he will speak up in a moment.

But to me, the problem involved here is not the right of what the President did; it is the wisdom. We have a right to do a great many things which are not very wise.

It is in this area that, with deep reluctance, I find myself in some disagreement with what has been done. But I say again, as I said earlier in my speech I hope we are on the way to correct that situation.

I have put in the RECORD the President's speech in New York last night. I do not agree with the 10th point, about whether what we are doing there is worthwhile, but I think the rest of it was a temporate statement of a position which is opposed to escalation, and shows determination that we will not be thrown out; and I am in accord with that

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

THE 1965 DESERTIONS UP IN SAIGON FORCES— TOTAL IS PUT ABOVE 96,000—U.S. AIDS CONCERNED

(By Neil Sheehan)

SAIGON, February 23.—About 96,000 men deserted from the South Vletnamese armed forces last year, a total equivalent to nearly half of the American force that has been committed to the defense of this country.

Actually, the figure reported by the South Vietnamese Government was higher, but informed sources said it did not take into account the fact that some of the deserters had later reenlisted. In addition, the figures are considered less than completely accurate because of the crude administrative procedures of the armed forces.

Nevertheless, the sources said, U.S. military officials consider the desertion rate very high and are deeply concerned about it.

high and are deeply concerned about it.

Total desertions for 1965 were put at 113,000. Of these, 47,000 were from the regular armed forces—army, navy, and air force—and 17,000 were from the regional forces, equivalent of the U.S. National Guard; 49,000 were from the popular forces, or local militia.

The sources could offer no specific reasons for the high rate of Government desertions other than the intensification of the fighting and a general war weariness that has overtaken the country.

Most of the men who desert, the sources said, do so either while still in training camps or while moving to their first assignments.

Figures were not available for desertions during 1964, but it was understood that they had been substantially below the 1965 figures.

Desertions from the regular armed forces nearly doubled during the last year, reaching about 14 percent of their total strength. Desertions from the 270,000-man army, which forms the great bulk of the regular armed forces, showed a gradual increase during the year. They ran near 18 percent of total strength in December.

The armed forces discharged 48,000 men for various reasons in 1965 and suffered 13,000 killed, 23,000 wounded, and 6,000 miss-

ing in action or captured.

OVERALL FORCE INCREASES

Despite the high desertions and other losses, the Government relied on intensive recruiting, more stringent conscription methods and the return of wounded to duty to increase the overall strength of the Armed Forces from 510,000 men in December 1964, to 571,000 in December 1965.

The regular Armed Forces, for example, inducted 114,000 men during the year—77,000

volunteers and 37,000 conscripts.

Most of the deserters were men who had originally volunteered for service. gional forces and popular forces—two militia units heavily affected-are composed entirely of volunteers. A majority of men in the regular Armed Forces also enlisted.

Most deserters, qualified sources suggest, do not defect to the Vietcong, but return to their homes in the villages, go into hiding or drift into the cities to look for civilian

jobs.

Vietcong defections to the Government during 1965 totaled about 11,000. No estimates are available for guerrillas who deserted from Communist units and did not report to Government authorities, but the number is believed to equal only a fraction of the desertions from the Government Armed Forces because the Vietcong usually exercise tighter control over their areas.

FOE STILL OUTNUMBERED

Although Government forces still outnumber the enemy by more than 2 to 1, the Vietcong have shown an ability to increase their overall strength more quickly than the Government. The total enemy force increased in the last year from 103,000 at the beginning of 1965 to 230,000 in December.

About 20,000 troops were North Viet-namese regulars who had infiltrated the south since last winter. About 40,000 more are political and administrative workers who

do little fighting.

In another report made available here today, a U.S. military spokesman said that in the week that ended Saturday, 83 American servicemen were killed in South Vietnam, 354 wounded and 4 reported missing in action. Twelve South Koreans and Australians were also killed, 17 wounded and 1 reported missing.

In the same period, 197 South Vietnamese

troops were killed.

The Vietcong guerrillas suffered 1,357 dead and 122 captured, according to the spokesman.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 24, 1966]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S REMARKS IN THE FREEDOM AWARDS

Twenty-five years ago-to a world darkened by war-President Franklin Roosevelt described the four freedoms of mankind: Freedom of speech and expression.

Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way.

Freedom from want.

Franklin Roosevelt knew that these freedoms could not be the province of one people alone. He called on his countrymen to assist those who endured the tyrant's bombs and suffered his oppression.

He called for courage-for generosity-for resolution in the face of terror. He said

"Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights-or keep them."

Wendell Willkie-Franklin Roosevelt's opponent in the campaign of 1940—shared his belief that freedom could not be founded only on American shores or only for those whose skin is white. "Freedom is an indivisible word," he said. "If we want to enjoy it, and fight for it, we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin."

That was Republican policy 25 years ago. It was Democratic policy 25 years ago. It is

American policy tonight.

How well have we done in our time in making the four freedoms real for our people, and for the people of the world?

Here in America we accord every man the right to worship as he wills. I believe we are more tolerant of religious or sectional differences than we were a quarter of a century ago. The majority of our people believe that a qualified man or woman-of any race—any religion—any section—could hold any office in the land. This was not so clear in 1940.

We are committed, now-however great the trial and tension—to protecting the right of free expression and peaceful dissent. We have learned to despise the witch hunt-the unprincipled harassment of a man's integrity and his right to be different. We have gained in tolerance—and I am determined to use the high office I hold to protect and encourage that tolerance.

I do not mean to say that I will remain altogether silent on the critical issues of our day. For just as strongly as I believe in other men's freedom to disagree, so do I believe in the President's freedom to persuade. Let me assure you that I will do everything

in my power to defend both.

AMERICAN RECORD

Twenty-five years ago "freedom from want" had the ring of urgency for our people. The unemployment rate stood at 14½ percent. Millions of Americans had spent the last decade in the breadlines or on farms where the winds howled away any chance for a decent life.

Tonight there are still millions whose poverty haunts our conscience. There are still fathers without jobs and children without hope.

Yet for the vast majority of Americans, these are times when the hand of plenty has replaced the grip of want. For the first time in almost 9 years, the unemployment rate has fallen to 4 percent.

This liberation from want-for which we thank God-is a testimony to the enduring vitality of our competitive economy.

It is a testimony also to an enlightened public policy, established by Franklin Roosevelt and strengthened by every administration since his death.

That policy has freed Americans for more hopeful, more productive lives.

It has relieved their fears of growing old-

by social security and medicare.

It has inspired them with hope for their children-by aid to elementary and higher education.

It has helped to create economic opportunity-by enlightened fiscal policies.

It has granted to millions, born into hopeless deprivation, the chance of a new start in life-by public works, private incentive, and poverty programs.

For the Negro American, it has opened the door-after centuries of enslavement and discrimination—to the blessings America offers to those willing and able to earn them.

Thus we address the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, 25 years after his message to America and the world, with confidence and with an unflagging determination. We have served his vision of the four freedoms essential to mankind-here in America.

DENIED ELSEWHERE

Yet we know he did not speak only for America. We know that the four freedoms are not secure in America when they are violently denied elsewhere in the world.

We know, too, that it requires more than speeches to resist the international enemies of freedom. We know that men respond to deeds when they are deaf to words. Even the precious word "freedom" may become empty to those without the means to use it.

For what does freedom mean when famine chokes the land; when new millions crowd upon already strained resources; when narrow privilege is entrenched behind law and custom; when all conspires to teach men that they cannot change the conditions of their

I do not need to tell you how five administrations have labored to give real meaning to freedom-in a world where it is often merely a phrase that conceals oppression and neglect. Men in

this room-men throughout America—have given their skills and treasure to that work. You have warned our peo-ple how insatiable is aggression—and how it thrives on human misery.

You have carried the word-that without the sense that they can change the conditions of their lives, nothing can avail the oppressed of this earth-neither good will, nor national sovereignty, nor massive grants of aid from their more fortunate brothers.

You have known, too, that men who believe they can change their destinies will change them.

Armed with that belief, they will be willing—yes, eager—to make the sacrifices that freedom demands. They will be anxious to shoulder the responsibilities that are inseparably bound to freedom.

They will be able to look beyond the four

essential freedoms:

To the freedom to learn, to master new skills, to acquaint themselves with the lore of man and nature.

To the freedom to grow, to become the best that is within them to become, to cast off the yoke of discrimination and disease. To the freedom to hope, and to build on

that hope, lives of integrity and well-being. This is what our struggle in Vietnam is about. This is what our struggle for equal

rights in this country is about.

We seek to create that climate-at home and abroad-where unlettered men can learn, where deprived children can grow, where hopeless millions can be inspired to change the terms of their existence for the better.

THREAT OF TERROR

The climate cannot be created where terror fills the air.

Children cannot learn-men cannot earn their bread-women cannot heal the sickwhere the night of violence has blotted out the sun.

Whether in the cities and hamlets of Vietnam, or in the ghettoes of our own cities, the struggle is the same. It is to end the violence against the human mind and bodyso that the work of peace may be done, and the fruits of freedom won.

We are pitting the resources of the lawof education and training-of our vision and our compassion-against that violence here at home. And we shall end it-in our time.

On the other side of the earth, we are no less committed to ending violence against men who are struggling to be free.

It is about that commitment that I wish to speak now.

Tonight, in Vietnam, more than 200,000 young Americans fight for freedom. Tonight our people are determined that these men shall have whatever help they need and that their cause—which is our cause—shall be sustained.

But in these last days there have been questions about what we are doing in Vietnam, and these questions have been answered loudly and clearly for every citizen to see and hear. The strength of America can never be sapped by discussion—and we have no better or stronger tradition than open debate in hours of danger. We believe, with Macaulay, that men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely.

We are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

What are the questions that are still being asked?

First, some ask if this is a war for unlimited objectives. The answer is plain: It is "No." Our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the success of aggression. It is not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination.

It is to prevent the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

Second, some ask if we are caught in a blind escalation of force that is pulling us headlong toward a wider war that no one wants. The answer—again—is "No." We are using that force—and only that force—necessary to stop the aggression. Our fighting men are in Vietnam because tens of thousands of invaders came South before them. Our numbers have increased—because the aggression of others has increased. The high hopes of the aggressor have been dimmed, and the tide of the battle has turned. Our measured use of force must be continued. But this is prudent firmness under careful control. There is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation.

Third, others ask if our fighting men are to be denied the help they need. The answer is again, and will be, a resounding "No." Our great Military Establishment has moved 200,000 men across 10,000 miles since last spring.

These men have, and will have, what they need to fight the aggressor. They have already performed miracles in combat. The men behind them have worked miracles of supply—building new ports, transporting new equipment, opening new roads.

The American forces of freedom are strong today in South Vietnam. And we will keep them so. They are led by a brilliant and resourceful commander—Gen. William C. Westmoreland. He knows the needs of war and he supports the works of peace. When he asks for more Americans to help the men he has, his requests will be immediately studied, and, as I promised last July, his needs will be met.

Fourth, some ask if our men go alone to Vietnam—if we alone respect our great commitment in the Southeast Asia Treaty. Still again the answer is "No." We have seven allies in SEATO and five of them are giving vital support, each with his own strength and in his own way, to the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

Fifth, some ask about the risk of wider war—perhaps against the vast land armies of Red China. And again the answer is "No," never by any act of ours—and not if there is any reason left behind the wild words from Peiping.

We have threatened no one—and we will not.

We seek the end of no regime—and we will not.

Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack, we will reply. We have measured the strength—and the weakness—of others, and we know our own. We observe in ourselves—and we applaud in others—a careful restraint in action. We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched by caution in deed.

Sixth, men ask if we rely on guns alone. Still again the answer is "No." From our Honolulu meeting, from the clear pledge which joins us with our allies in Saigon, there has emerged a common dedication to the peaceful progress of the people of Vietnam—to schools for their children, to care for their health, to hope and bounty for their land.

The Vice President returned today from his constructive and highly successful visit to Saigon and other capitals, and he tells me that he and Ambassador Lodge have found a new conviction and purpose in South Vietnam—for the battle against want and injustice as well as the battle against aggression.

So the pledge of Honolulu will be kept, and the pledge of Baltimore stands open—to help the men of the North when they have the wisdom to be ready.

We Americans must understand how fundamental is the meaning of this second war-the war on want. I talked on my farm last fall with Secretary Freeman, and in my office last week with Secretary Gardnermaking, over and over again, the same central point: The breeding ground of war is human misery. If we are not to fight forever in faraway places-in Europe, or the Far Pacific, or the jungles of Africa, or the suburbs of Santo Domingo, then we must learn to get at the roots of violence. As a nation, we must magnify our struggle against world hunger and illiteracy and disease. We must bring hope to men lives now end at twoscore or less. Without that hope-without progress in this war on want-we will be called to fight again and again, as we must today.

Seventh, men ask who has a right to rule in South Vietnam. Our answer there is what it has been here for 200 years: The people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people—and no one else. Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. We will insist for ourselves on what we require from Hanoi: respect for the principle of government by the consent of the governed. We stand for self-determination—for free elections—and we will honor their result.

Eighth, men ask if we are neglecting any hopeful chance of peace. And the answer A great servant of peace, Secretary is "No." Rusk, has sent the message of peace on every wire and by every hand to every continent. A great pleader for peace, Arthur Goldberg, has worked at home and abroad in this same cause. Their undiscouraged efforts will continue. How much wiser it would have been, how much more compassionate toward its own people, if Hanoi had come to the bargaining table at the close of the year. Then the 7,000 Communist troops who have died in battle since January 1-and the many thousands who have been wounded in that same period-could have lived at peace with their fellow men. Today-as then-Hanoi has the opportunity to end the increasing toll the war is taking on those under its command.

Ninth, some ask how long we must bear this burden. To that question—in all honesty—I can give no answer tonight. During the Battle of Britain when that nation stood alone in 1940, Winston Churchill gave no answer to that question. When the forces of freedom were driven from the Philippines, President Roosevelt could not and did not

name the date we would return. If the aggressor persists in Vietnam, the struggle may be long. Our men in battle know and accept this hard fact. We who are at home can do as much. There is no computer that can tell the hour and day of peace, but we do know that it will come only to the stead-fast—never to the weak in heart.

Tenth, and finally, men ask if it is worth it. I think you know the answer. It is the answer that Americans have given for a quarter of a century, wherever American strength has been pledged to prevent aggression. The contest in Vietnam is confused and hard, and many of its forms are new. Yet our purpose and policy are unchanged.

Our men in Vietnam are there to keep a promise made 12 years ago. The Southeast Asia Treaty promised—as Secretary John Foster Dulles said for the United States—"that an attack upon the treaty area would occasion a reaction so united, so strong, and so well placed that the aggressor would lose more than it could hope to gain." But we keep more than a specific treaty promise in Vietnam. We keep the faith for freedom.

PRESIDENTS' PLEDGES

Four Presidents have pledged to keep that faith.

The first was Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his state of the Union message 25 years ago. He said: "* * * we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom."

The second was Harry S. Truman, in 1947, at a historic turning point in the history of guerrilla warfare—and of Greece and Turkey and the United States. These were his words:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

"I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way."

The third was Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his first inaugural address. He promised this: "Realizing that common sense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. Americans, indeed, all freemen, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

And then 5 years ago, John F. Kennedy, on the cold bright noon of his first day in office, proclaimed:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

This is the American tradition. Built in free discussion, proven on a hundred battle-fields, rewarded by a progress at home that has no match in history, it beckons us forward now to the work of peace in Vietnam.

We will build freedom while we fight, and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high hard road of freedom. We are too old to be foolhardy and too young to be tired-too strong for fear and too determined for retreat.

Each evening when I retire, I take upfrom a bedside table—reports from the battlefront and from the capitals of the world. They tell me how our men have fared that day in the hills and valleys of Vietnam. They tell me what hope there seems to be that the message of peace will be heard, and this tragic war ended.

I read of individual acts of heroism-of dedicated men and women whose valor matches that of any generation that has gone before. I read of men risking their lives to save others—of men giving their lives for freedom.

Always among these reports are a few

letters from the men themselves.

If there is doubt among some here at home about our purposes in Vietnam, I do not find it reflected in these letters. Our soldiers, our marines, our airmen, our sailors, know why they are in Vietnam. They know—as five Presidents have known-how inseparably bound together are America's freedom and the freedom of her friends in the world.

Tonight I ask each citizen to join me-in the homes and meeting places our men are fighting to keep free from oppression-in a prayer for their safety.

I ask you to join me in a pledge to the cause for which they fight-the cause of

human freedom.

I ask you for your help-for your understanding and your commitment—so that this united people may show forth to the world that America has not ended the only struggle worthy of man's unceasing sacrifice—the struggle to be free.

Ехнівіт 3 THE TACTICS OF A TRUCE (By Jack D. Forbes)

To one degree or another all the parties engaged in the Vietnamese civil war profess a desire for peace, and yet the war continues. In part this is because no peace proposals made by either side have thus far included guarantees to protect the interests of all participants. The North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front appear to desire conditions very unfavorable to the Saigon junta and the United States, while the latter groups appear intent upon the annihilation or disappearance of the NLF. No peace can be arranged until conditions are set forth which recognize the interests of all Vietnamese factions, including tribal groups, Buddhists, and neutralists.

In making any peace proposal, it must be assumed that all parties truly desire an end to hostilities, providing only that their relative positions of strength are not diminished by the immediate postwar stage of developments. Any serious peace proposal must realistically respect that condition.

The first step in any move toward peace would be the recognition by the United States that the Vietnamese war is a civil war, that the several most interested participants-NLF, Buddhists, tribesmen, neutralists, Saigon junta leaders, North Vietnamese, Catholics, et al.—deserve recognition as legitimately concerned groups and that no one of these parties can pretend to speak for the South Vietnamese or the Vietnamese as a whole. The United States must also face the quite obvious fact that the Saigon junta has no claim to call itself a legitimate government, being merely the end result of numerous unconstitutional seizures power. It has no more claim to represent the South Vietnamese people than does the NLF or FULRO (the tribal alliance). brief, there is no government in South Vietnam, but rather several factions engaged in military-political struggle. And the United States must admit that it is the only significant non-Vietnamese participant in the civil war and that if it were not for the

U.S. intervention the war would doubtless involve only Vietnamese.

Any serious peace proposal must, I believe, rest upon the following principles: (1) that a cease-fire must be arranged as a precondition for real negotiations under United Nations supervision; (2) that only the United Nations can properly supervise the transition to peace; (3) that South Vietnam will have to be under international control for a number of years to prevent a resumption of the civil war or the seizure of power by one faction; and (4) that all interested parties must not only be involved in the peace negotiations but must be provided with face-saving arrangements which will give all groups the opportunity for claiming a moral if not a military victory. I believe that the following proposal meets these conditions.

A cease fire should immediately be arranged, on the basis of existing "fronts," no matter how complicated the boundaries may be. Second, all military units in South Vietnam should be immediately placed under United Nations command and all non-Vietnamese (principally United States) and North Vietnamese troops should be withdrawn under United Nations supervision according to a carefully arranged schedule.

At the same time that United States, North Vietnamese, Australian and South Korean troops are evacuated, equivalent numbers of United Nations units, derived from neutralist or nonalined nations, should be intro-duced. Once all foreign and North Vietnamese troops have been replaced, a coalition government should be created, representing all factions, including tribal groups and non-Vietnamese minorities. As soon as conditions are appropriate, within perhaps 6 months, free elections should be held under the close supervision of United Nations authorities. Proportional representation for all parties and factions should be guaranteed, so as to insure the participation of all groups.

The United Nations forces should remain in South Vietnam for a period of at least 5 years subsequent to the first free elections and at least 1 year after the second free elections in order to guarantee that no powerful faction violates constitutional guarantees in the interim. Such a United Nations presence should also guarantee full freedom of speech and political activity.

During the 5-year (minimum) period of United Nations supervision, the armed forces of all South Vietnamese factions should be demobilized and replaced by a minimumsized police force under civilian control. Likewise, the Mekong River project (or a similar scheme of economic development) should be implemented. The United States should—as it easily can—bear much of the cost of both the U.N. operation and the Mekong project.

Such a procedure as proposed above would I believe, provide adequate protection for all factional interests. It would avoid further bloodshed and allow the South Vietnamese time in which to determine their own destiny. It would make full use of the United Nations, the only agency designed to settle a conflict such as exists in Vietnam. Finally, it would set a precedent for United Nations interim control of contested regions which might well be useful in Laos, Korea, Germany, and elsewhere.

Ехнівіт 4

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1966] "BUT 'TWAS A FAMOUS VICTORY"

General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told two groups of Senators that "in the long term, we can achieve military victory" in Vietnam. But President Johnson has said: "We know, as our adversaries should also know, that there is no

purely military solution in sight for either side.

It is being asked here and abroad: What is American policy? The American military men, on the whole, believe that the United States can and should achieve what they call a victory in Vietnam. The aim, as President Johnson has usually-but not alwaysexpressed it, is that of a limited war proving that the United States cannot and will not be driven from South Vietnam. However. Secretary McNamara says he knows of no military expert in the Department of Defense who supports the "enclave," or limited strategy, concept; and after hearing Gen. Maxwell Taylor's testimony yesterday, tor FULBRIGHT concluded that present U.S. policy "logically leads to unconditional surrender" and "to unlimited commitment."

The war cannot be won on the military front, and it is deceptive to let Americans and South Vietnamese believe that it can. Of course, the United States has the manpower and the firepower to destroy the Vietcong-but only by destroying all of South

Vietnam in the process.

A "victory" that kills a few hundred Vietcong and at the same time destroys whole fertile valleys with their crops, their pitiful villages and huts and many of their innocent men, women, and children, is not going "win" the war in Vietnam for anybody. Yet, as the Times correspondent Neil Sheehan showed in a vivid description, this is exactly what happened in Binhdinh Province in the recent massive allied sweep.

No one wins in such a victory. Everybody loses. Multiply the experience of Binhdinh Province a hundred times; spread it over all of South and North Vietnam, and what will the United States then proudly show to the world and to history? "A famous victory"?

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1966] WASHINGTON: THE RUSK DOCTRINE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 19 .- Secretary of State Rusk has put a grim doctrine before the people of this country. He was a responsive and forthright witness before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and it is important that we understand what he thinks our duties and responsibilities are in the world.

First, in Vietnam, we are to commit to the battle whatever is necessary to end the aggression and bring about the freedom and

security of South Vietnam.

What this means, he conceded, depends primarily on what the enemy commits (the Chinese committed 1 million men to battle in Korea). He would not say there was no limit to the men and material the United States would send to Vietnam, but he stuck to his proposition that we would maintain military superiority there no matter how long it took to stop the fighting.

RUSK'S OBJECTIVE

This objective, it should be noted, was not made conditional on what the South Vietnamese or any of the other allies contributed to the fighting. There is no longer much talk here of victory depending primarily on the South Vietnamese Army. Mr. Rusk discussed the freedom of South Vietnam as a vital American interest, essential to our own security and critical to all the other security commitments we have taken to over 40 other countries. This is a formidable

Second, the Secretary of State gave an interesting interpretation of America's obligations as a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. In the event of armed aggression against the territory covered by that treaty, he said, America's obligation to oppose the aggression did not depend on all the members agreeing to oppose it, but it was America's duty to do so regardless of

what the others did (which in Vietnam is very little).

THE AMERICAN COMMITMENTS

This did not mean, Secretary Rusk remarked, that the United States was obligated to oppose Communist aggression everywhere in the world or that we were going around looking for fights to put down. For example, we did not oppose Communist China's aggression in Tibet or the Soviet Union's aggression in Hungary, for we had not taken any commitment to do so, but this still leaves us with commitments the like of which no sovereign nation ever took in the history of the world.

For the United States is committed to oppose Communist aggression all along the periphery of the Communist nations from the North Cape of Norway through the heart of Europe to Greece and Turkey (NATO); along the southern frontier of the Soviet Union in the Near and Middle East (the Eisenhower resolution); and thence through southeast Asia (SEATO) to Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Japan and Korea. And if you add our obligations under the Organization of American States and our obligations under the United Nations, you take in most of the rest of the world.

The Rusk doctrine makes the Monroe Doctrine or the Truman doctrine seem rather cheap. Monroe limited his commitments to the Western Hemisphere. Truman wanted to oppose communism primarily by economic means. And even John Foster Dulles, who was not a timid man, thought each alliance should stand on its own terms and depend to some degree on what the other members of the alliance did.

But the Rusk doctrine draws no distinction between powerful industrial democratic states in Europe and weak undemocratic states in Asia. His view seems to be that the United States must redeem the promises of every alliance it has signed regardless of what the other signatories do, and that fallure to keep everybody's promise in one alliance will destroy the confidence of the world in all other alliances we have signed.

THAT BLANK CHECK

If this is true, it is odd that most of our allies in Europe, the Middle East and even in Japan are critical of our operations in Vietnam, but this is the thesis Mr. Rusk placed before the Foreign Relations Committee.

And the interesting thing is that the Senators cannot really do much about it, which accounts for all the frustration they have demonstrated on the TV screens in the last few days. For in the moment of crisis during the Communist attack on our ships in the Gulf of Tonkin, President Johnson asked for a blank check to deal with aggression all over southeast Asia—including the right to use any force "he" deemed necessary—and once he had published that request, the Congress had no choice but to grant it to him or—what was unthinkable—repudiate him in the face of the enemy.

THE SENATE'S DILEMMA

Nor can the Senate do anything to take back this promise under present circumstances. If Senator Morse presses his resolution to withdraw the Tonkin Gulf resolution, obviously few if any Congressmen are going to vote with him and turn their backs on the 200,000 Americans now fighting in Vietnam.

But their helplessness merely emphasizes the transformation that has taken place in American and world politics. The President, if he chooses his time carefully, can obviously get almost any commitment he likes from the Congress in the moment of crisis, and under the Rusk doctrine, we are then obliged to redeem each commitment, regardless of what the other parties to the agreement do, or risk the destruction of the

entire system of American alliances created since the last war.

All this goes well beyond Vietnam in space and time, Mr. Rusk has asked the Senate to contain the expansion of communism all along the periphery of the Communist empire, by force of arms and without allies if necessary, and the Congress cannot oppose him in present circumstances without opposing its own men in Vietnam, which it obviously will not do.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post] THE AGNOSTIC VOICE (By Joseph Kraft)

One voice, it seems to me, has been missing from the clamor over whether or not to resume bombing North Vietnam. It is the voice of those who don't know, and know they

don't know—the voice of the agnostics.

Perhaps above all others, however, the agnostic voice deserves to be heard. For while dogmatic assertions are expressed in all quarters at all times, the fact is that American policy in Vietnam is largely grounded on hunches, guesses, prejudices, and assumptions—on propositions that are unknown

and unknowable, untested and untestable. For example, there is the assumption that the National Liberation Front, or Vietcong insurgent movement, is the pure puppet of the Hanoi government in North Vietnam. To hear the Secretary of State tell it, no doubt on that score can even be admitted.

But the U.S. Government knows next to nothing about the politics of the Vietcong. Systematic investigation was not even begun until late last summer. The study that resulted offers no explanation of why the Vietcong changed its secretary general three times in less than a year—a critical development. It does not indicate why the admittedly Communist element of the front, the People's Revolutionary Party was not set up until 1962, or why it was set up then—another critical development. It asserts that the secretary general of the Communist wing of the front is a man who has been for the last 3 years in Algiers—a manifest absurdity.

A second assumption in Washington is that there is no interest in negotiating on the part of the Hanol government. That view is now supplemented by confident assertions that such experienced and Western-oriented leaders as President Ho Chi Minh and Premier Pham Van Dong have lost power to a Chinese-oriented hard-liner—Le Duan, the secretary general of the North Vietnameses Communist Party.

But that whole story finds its source in an English scholar, P. J. Honey. Mr. Honey has been out of North Vietnam for years. He has argued that since Ho Chi Minh is a clever fellow who would not work his country into a box, and that since North Vietnam is now plainly in a bad box, Ho Chi Minh cannot possibly be running the country. That theory, even if it had a respectable base in logic, is at least put into question by several visitors who have seen Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi during the last 2 months.

As to the notion that Le Duan is a Chineseoriented hard-liner, it is pure speculation. It is matched by an equally justified speculation that Le Duan takes a middle position between those in Hanoi who look toward Moscow and those who look toward Peiping.

Still a third Washington assumption is that the Vietnamese struggle is a first step in a long-range Communist Chinese program for world domination. In support of that view Secretary of State Rusk and, following his lead, Secretary of Defense McNamara, have cited as the "Chinese Mein Kampf" a long article on strategic doctrine written by the Chinese defense minister, Lin Piao, last fall.

But as a recent study of the article by the Rand Corp. indicates, the Lin Piao statement can be read as a move by Peiping to wash its hands of the Vietnamese war. And to me, at least, there are indications both in the Lin Piao statement and in the important speech made recently by the political director of the Chinese army, Hsiao Hua, that the true point at issue is a struggle between Hanoi and Pelping for control over the Vietcong.

It may be, of course, that all the ruling official assumptions in Washington are right. But that is not the point. The point is that they rest on a foundation of guesswork. This country cannot be certain, or even close to certain, about any of the central political relations on the other side.

In this circumstance, agnosticism seems to me a healthy state of mind. And if it does not solve the question whether or not to bomb, it suggests the wisdom of caution; of not moving except when absolutely necessary; of a modest no-lose, as against an ambitious win; strategy; of small steps by small things.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post] THE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL KY (By Walter Lippmann)

The Honolulu meeting has a critical bearing on the attempts to bring about some kind of negotiation. There are several parallel attempts now underway—by the Secretary General of the United Nations, by the Pope, by a group of unalined governments, as well as various private diplomatic explorations. The status and the role of the Vietcong or as it calls itself, the National Liberation Front, in the negotiations is the key problem which must be solved in order that any kind of talks can begin. For inasmuch as the Vietcong is in military control of a large part of South Vietnam, a peace cannot be negotiated if the Vietcong does not participate in the negotiations.

There are, I understand, under consideration two formulas for dealing with the Vietcong. One is that a reconvened Geneva Conference should consist of the five great powers—China, the Soviet Union, the United States, France, and Great Britain, plus representatives of the North Vietnamese Government, plus two delegations from South Vietnam, one representing the Saigon government and the other the Vietcong. This formula reflects the actual military situation. For there are in being two powers in South Vietnam. Neither can be ignored in the making of peace.

This formula has been vetoed by the United States because it refuses to give the Viet-cong any recognition as a government. There is now under consideration, therefore, a second formula. The reconvened Geneva Conference would consist of the Big Five, the two governments in Hanoi and Saigon, plus a delegation from the Vietcong. It may be as Ambassador Harriman seemed to suggest in a radio interview on Sunday, that this formula would be acceptable to the Administration. It would be very good news indeed if it were also acceptable to the other governments concerned.

In any event, since we are informed that no new important military decisions are being taken in Honolulu, the most important thing we need to know is what understanding the President reaches with General Ky about the format of the negotiations which we have asked the U.N. to promote. The fanfare of the reception could mean that the President has decided to commit this country to liquidate the Vietcong and to establish undisputed rule by General Ky or his successors over all of South Vietnam. But it might also conceivably mean that the President is talking turkey with General Ky and is telling him to get ready for the readjustment of U.S. policy in accordance with the real military prospects in Vietnam.

What, in short, has General Ky been promised? That is the question which will have to be answered if the American people do indeed have the right to know what they

are fighting for and what kind of war they are involved in.

The President's speech of welcome to the two Vietnamese leaders was full of righteous indignation and scorn for those of us who still adhere to the long-established American military doctrine, followed by every President until Lyndon Johnson, that we must refrain from becoming involved in a land war fought predominantly by Americans against Aslans on the Asian Continent. They believe, as Winston Churchill is reported to have said, that we must not jump into the water to fight the sharks.

Even General MacArthur, who fought the Korean land war, insisted repeatedly that the old American doctrine was sound. This was also the view of General Ridgway and of General Gavin, and of their Commander in Chief, President Elsenhower. No one needs to be abashed because he adheres to this doctrine. Nor need he refrain from pointing out that what is going on in Vietnam has been demonstrating that the doctrine is sound.

I do not think the President is a good historian when he says that those who are looking for ways to liquidate as humanely and honorably as possible what has proven to be a gigantic mistake "belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope." The historical truth of the matter is that those who think the President is mistaken base their conviction on a reading of the history of our era, particularly on the relations between the Western white governments and the peoples of Asia. In this historical perspective it is Lyndon Johnson who has broken not only with the old American wisdom but also with the new knowledge of the world as it is.

"We cannot accept their logic," said the President, "that tyranny 10,000 miles away is not tyranny to concern us." The President's critics are not saying that tyranny 10,000 miles away does not concern us. They are saying that we cannot and should not set up alone as judges, juries, and policemen wherever there is tyranny on the face of the globe. They are saying that we have enough to do within the undoubted areas of our vital interests in Europe and in this hemisphere and in the Pacific and that we should not pretend to omnipotence and omniscience.

The President's hot and unexamined generalities are a moral commitment to endless crusading in all the continents. As one who has never been an isolationist or a pacifist, I am dismayed by the exaggerations and generalizations which have been allowed to grow out of the great debate about isolation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 1, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S SEARCH FOR PEACE (By Walter Lippmann)

The resumption of bombing in North Vietnam is not a surprise, indeed it has been inevitable since the diplomatic content of the peace offensive was set. For on neither side has there been any overt effort to find the terms of a truce which reflect correctly the actual military situation. On both sides there has been some suggestion of softening the demands a little. But the basic objective of our adversaries remains the ascendancy of the Vietcong in South Vietnam, and our basic objective, as articulated repeatedly by Secretary Rusk, is the liquidation of the Vietcong and the ascendancy of General Ky and his successors in Saigon.

The whole worldwide attempt to end the fighting by negotiations is stalled on this disparity. The essential fact about the conflict of aims is that each side has a political objective which is beyond its military capacity. Insofar as Hanoi, and more certainly Peiping, are demanding the withdrawal of the U.S. forces before there is a political settlement in Indochina, they are demanding

more than they have the military power to achieve. The United States is able to stand fast and hold on.

On the other hand, insofar as we are tied to Secretary Rusk's objectives, to defeat and eliminate the Vietcong, to keep the 2,800 villages permanently secured against the Vietcong, and to create a government in Saigon that, without being an American colonial government, is the ruler of the whole of South Vietnam—insofar as these are our purposes in Vietnam, we are fighting a war which is far beyond our or anyone else's military and political capacity.

The search for peace, to which the President rededicated himself as he announced the end of the bombing pause, will succeed or fail as we and they bring war aims into balance with military capacity. This will certainly not be done simultaneously by both sides. But if one side makes the first move, it will be difficult for the other not to follow suit

Thus, if Hanoi says clearly, what it has hinted at vaguely, that the American forces need not withdraw before negotiations bring about an agreed settlement, it would be difficult, indeed impossible in the long run, for the administration to deny that the Vietcong must in fact be a principal party to a negotiated truce.

It is also within our power to break the deadlock which has caused the peace offensive to fail. And as we are the stronger the more invulnerable, it is both our duty and our interest to take the initiative. No one. I suppose, imagines any longer that the deadlock can be broken by bombing, by a little bombing or by a lot of bombing. And there are few observers of the war who think that the deadlock can be broken by doubling or tripling our forces. The way to break the deadlock is to adopt a military strategy which, because it has a limited objective, can be made to prevail by limited Thus, when and if we move to a means. holding strategy, we shall have revised and reduced our war aims to something more modest but more credible than Mr. Rusk's unattainable pursuit of the independence of the whole of South Vietnam under General Ky and his successors in Saigon.

I regard both the bombing pause and the resumption of the bombing as irrevelant to the real problem, which is how to make a truce which is consistent with the military realities, Some will say that by more and bigger bombing and by a big buildup of troops we shall be able to change the military realities in our favor. Experience and the history of this wretched war are against that hope. For the forces against us can be increased indefinitely, and the notion of a decisive military superiority over the land powers of Asia is a dangerous fantasy.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1966] New Light on U.S. Policy—General Taylor SAYS AIM IS TO COMPEL ACCEPTANCE OF A FREE SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Max Frankel)

Washington, February 17.—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor brought out in public today what other high officials here have made increasingly plain in private—namely that the U.S. terms for peace in Vietnam are much stiffer than the offer of "unconditional" negotiations has implied. Though caught up in a debate with some members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about whether the administration's goals were "limited" or "unlimited," General Taylor left little doubt about what those goals are. He said the United States could, should and would achieve military and political successes of sufficient magnitude to force the Communists to accept an independent and non-Communist South Vietnam.

The Johnson administration has never wavered in the pursuit of that objective.

Nor has it said anything to contradict the retired general's assertion that his personal testimony was wholly consistent with official policy.

Many observers and diplomats here and abroad, however, have misinterpreted the administration's offer to negotiate as an offer to compromise with the Vietcong in South Vietnam. General Taylor's testimony should have made it clear that such a compromise is not anticipated here.

That clarification was explicitly recognized at the end of the long hearing today by Senator J. M. FULBRIGHT, the committee chairman. The Arkansas Democrat said it seemed to him, in the language of the Ozarks, that the United States intended to apply the pressure until the Communists "holier enuff."

He said he wished instead that the administration was ready to deal with its principal adversary, the Vietcong, to seek "a compromise to stop the slaughter" and to give up the policy of waging a war that can end only "if all the Vietcong would go home and go north."

THE BASIC QUESTION

General Taylor did not dispute this summation of the essence of the argument between the administration and its critics. If the Vietcong would in fact go home and stop trying to take over South Vietnam, he said, they could at least obtain "compensation"—presumably in economic aid to North Vietnam. But his basic reply was a question "How do you compromise the freedom of 15 million South Vietnamese people?"

Compromise has had no appeal here because the administration concluded long ago that the non-Communist forces of South Vietnam could not long survive in a Saigon coalition with Communists. It is for that reason—and not because of an excessively rigid sense of protocol—that Washington has steadfastly refused to deal with the Vietcong or to recognize them as an independent political force.

It has offered to consider the Vietcong's "views" in negotiations and even to let the Vietcong sit in the delegation of North Vietnam, whose agents it says they are. Washington's purpose at such negotiations would be to ratify the end of the Communist threat to South Vietnam and not to compromise on the basis of the existing military balance.

As General Taylor reiterated, the administration believes the Communists have not been hurt sufficiently on the battlefield to enter into the kind of negotiations that have been offered. Privately, officials here agree with this presumed Communist assessment. They believe the Communists would now negotiate or give up only if they were prepared to honor the potential force that the United States can bring to bear.

As General Taylor also made clear, even the potential American military might is not enough to assure success. Force on the ground must be used to put the Communists into a "highly unfavorable" situation in South Vietnam, he said, while force in the air is used to inflict increasing loss and pain in North Vietnam.

NEED FOR VIABLE REGIME

In addition, he emphasized, the United States must construct a reasonably viable and stable government in South Vietnam and demonstrate a determination at home to see the struggle through.

The general said he was convinced that when all four conditions were met, North Vietnam would have been brought to the point where it was willing to talk. The purpose of the talks, he stressed, would be to "free South Vietnam from the Vietcong" and the essential ingredient is to "have them so beaten they'd be glad to come in and accept an amnesty."

These goals are not only "limited" but realistic, the general contended, although he would not be pinned down on the number of American troops that might have to become involved. The present 205,000 are not enough, he said, and 800,000 would be "fan-

tastic" and unnecessary.

It is the realism of this assessment that troubled most of the administration's critics on the committee. They fear that no limits to the American involvement are in sight and that it could lead to an even more costly war with Communist China. Some seek more precise estimates of the ultimate cost, while others would prefer a reduction of the objectives-in other words, a compromise on the basis of present military and political strength.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

OFFICER. The The PRESIDING clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without

objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I would hope that other Senators desiring to speak on this subject would make themselves available to discuss it. I realize the difficulty of bringing Senators in, particularly those who have gone home in the snow, at this time of the evening. I had hoped that at least until 7 o'clock this evening, those who wanted to discuss the resolution would discuss it. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum, and try to send word to all those desirous of making speeches that we would appreciate it if they would come and get their speeches made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am willing to tender my judgment and the information I have received, but it is certainly not information involving all Senators; it is information, apparently involving those who are opposed to the bill, or think they wish to make some qualifying statements before they vote on it, that none of those are ready to make any speeches tonight, but that they will be here to make speeches tomorrow. I do not think, unless there are some in favor of the bill who wish to make speeches, that we will be very successful in getting any more speeches tonight.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I doubt very much that we will. My only feeling about the matter is-and I do not expect to vote tonight—that I would like to get the speeches made; and so I think it might be well to let the clerk call the roll. and while he is doing it, undertake to ascertain if any Senators desirous of making speeches are ready to make them.

I would urge Senators who wish to speak to make their speeches, so that we can proceed to a vote. They have been on notice now for at least 17 days that this matter was going to be before the Senate. We have had at least 7 days of debate. There have been 7 days that have intervened in between, when Senators had time to prepare their speeches; and I would hope that those who wish to

make speeches would come and make

So I now suggest the absence of a dilonim

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for one moment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I plead with the Senator to recognize the existence of the snowstorm, the lateness of the hour, and the fact that there are still several Senators who desire to make speeches who were not advised that we might be held in late tonight.

I call the Senator's attention to the custom of the majority leader in this regard, and express the very friendly hope that he will be willing to adjourn the Senate now, and come back in tomorrow. If he wishes to come back earlier tomorrow, that is all right, but-

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not plan earlier than usual. As a matter of fact. may I say to the Senator that I hope to make some progress with the Senate Finance Committee tomorrow: it is my thought that we might make some headway there, even if we fail to do so here.

I am on notice that a request to permit the Committee on Finance to meet while the Senate is in session would also meet with objection and, therefore, I do not propose that the Senate come in until noon tomorrow; but, I am merely trying to ascertain if there are any Senators available who desire to make speeches and put themselves on record on this matter. If none are available, then we will adjourn and meet tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I certainly wish to cooperate with the Senator from Louisiana. I was off the floor. I had to go over to my office for a manuscript-judging program. I am one of three judges on projects for some honors: but while I was there, I got in touch with two Senators who I know are going to speak on the bill. I asked each one of them if there was any chance of their making speeches tonight, and both told me that they had not gotten them "out of the typewriter" yet. Therefore, they cannot possibly make them until tomorrow. Of course, I can speak only for those two Senators. They will be given tomorrow. I do not know about the others. I believe that the Senator will find—as I told him earlier—that the speeches will probably all be delivered by late Tuesday, and the Senate can begin to vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Oregon predicted some time ago, if I recall correctly, that the Senate would be able to vote on this measure this week. I know that he made that prediction in good faith. I am sure that he will, in all probability, conclude the speeches he wishes to make on the subject this week.

However, I cannot bind other Senators. They are entitled to come in and be heard, make their views available for the RECORD, explain how they will vote and why they will vote, and how they believe others should vote.

I am therefore merely going to suggest the absence of a quorum in order that anyone who might wish to make a speech will be able to make it. If a Senator has, by this time, managed to get his speech "out of the typewriter," we would appreciate it if he would come on over and make it. Therefore, Mr. President, for those reasons, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have made the effort to determine if there are any other Senators who desire to make speeches tonight and are available to make them. My best information is that no one is available to make speeches this evening.

I would hope that one of these days we could find the answer to the problem of Senators who wish to make speeches and ask the leadership to hold up the Nation's business because they are not ready, when we have given them more than 2½ weeks to get prepared. Further, I would hope, one of these days, that we could work out some modification of the rules of the Senate so that we would not have requests by Senators that the Senate not vote because they have made commitments in their States, or elsewhere, and cannot be in the Chamber at the time of voting on a very important matter.

It occurs to me that perhaps one answer to the latter problem would be that we might agree to a modification of the rules of the Senate so that, let us say, on 5 days out of the year a Senator could. by unanimous consent, have a live pair arranged, so that he could be absent, and the person who agreed to give him the live pair could ask unanimous consent that both he and the absentee Senator be paired and be recorded as voting. rather than being recorded as not voting.

If that could be done, it would expedite the work of the Senate. It would be convenient to Senators and would help the Senate get on with the Nation's business. It would also greatly reduce the requests upon Members of this body, particularly at the leadership level, to keep the Senate in session because they could not be in the Chamber for a particular vote and did not wish anything to happen until they got back.

Mr. President, I know that Senators make these commitments and wish to be present and recorded as voting. should, in my judgment, seek to restore respectability to the live pair as it existed in the Senate 30 years ago. We should also seek to restore some of our fine old traditions, and establish new ones, in order to carry on more efficiently the Nation's business.

My thought would be that, if we could arrange it so that-without abusing the privilege-if a Senator could not be present, he could be recorded as voting rather than as not voting, by unanimous consent of the Senate, it would very much expedite the procedures of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are Senators who are still disposed to make speeches, although they are not prepared to make them at this time, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 25, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 24, 1966:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Lee C. White, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1970.

Environmental Science Services Administration

The nominations beginning Clinton D. Upham, to be commander, and ending John K. Callahan, Jr., to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 1966.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning David Gershowitz, to be captain, and ending Charles R. Polly, to be chief warrant officer, W-3, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 18, 1966.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, D.D., Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

"For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth," saith the Lord.—Isaiah 55: 10-11.

We thank Thee, O Lord, that as the snow settles upon the earth, so Thy word can settle in our minds and hearts. Grant, O God, that as that word penetrates our thinking, it may bring forth the fruit of wise decisions and right actions.

We thank Thee today for him who, over the last several years, has led this body so often in prayer. We thank Thee for his witness and continuing influence. Grant Thy blessing upon his loved ones. May they be comforted by their memories of his life, and by their hope for the life to come.

We pray for the Nation for whom he prayed so often. We love our Nation, Lord. We thank Thee for its ideal of "liberty and justice for all." We confess we have not fully achieved the ideal, but, O God, keep us always moving

in that direction. May no selfishness on our part, or lack of understanding, keep us from working for our Nation's welfare. We pray for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with an amendment to the bill S. 251, to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, in which concurrence of the House is requested.

The message also announced that Mr. Magnuson, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 46, United States Code, section 1126c, appointed Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Proutry to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that Mr. Magnuson, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, section 194(a), appointed Mr. Bass and Mr. Pearson to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

COMPENSATION OF TEACHERS AND TEACHING POSITIONS UNDER THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OVER-SEAS TEACHERS PAY AND PER-SONNEL PRACTICES ACT

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, and disagree to the amendments of the Senate and request a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Murray, Morrison, Udall, Corbett, and Broyhill of North Carolina.

PROPER LAND USE PROMISES LASTING BENEFIT

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, in the rapidly expanding urban and industrial area around Atlanta, we have come to appreciate the importance of wise land use planning to protect the community's valuable soil and water resources, and for the long-term benefit of investors in the Atlanta economy.

The Atlanta region is experiencing the same land use problems as those found in other dynamic metropolitan areas in the Nation. The answers to these problems are much the same everywhere. They are based on proper evaluation of the soils; following through with development programs that the particular type of soil will adequately support; taking the necessary steps to protect against erosion from land under development, and stabilizing the soil immediately following development.

Local governments, institutions, and urban and industrial developers in the Atlanta region have wisely sought, and have received, expert help from qualified soil and water conservation technicians in planning the best possible use of land under development.

The Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the State of Georgia, has provided vital technical assistance on soil and water conservation problems. In the State as a whole, SCS soil scientists last year completed soil surveys on about 1,870,000 acres of land.

I am confident that soil surveys will be used increasingly in Georgia's Fourth District to determine the best possible use of the land in a developing economy; to protect the land from erosion, the rivers and streams in the area from siltation, and those who buy and build on the land from loss due to building on soil that is not suited to the purpose.

I heartily commend the Federal, State, and local cooperation which has made possible the soil surveys and other soil and water conservation measures in the Atlanta area and throughout Georgia's Fourth Congressional District. Through experience, we have come to appreciate the immense value of these services—for the lasting benefit of this important and rapidly growing region of the American Southland.

HEARINGS IN REGARD TO THE B-727 AIRPLANE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to announce that next Tuesday, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have before it in executive session the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to discuss the subject of the B-727 airplane.

All of us are aware that in the past few months there have been several regret-table accidents involving this type of aircraft. Many Members of the House have indicated to me their rightful concern over what has happened and what is being done to avoid repetition.

I wish to indicate that the formal investigations of the aviation authorities are going forward to determine what may have been the causes of the accidents and the steps that need to be taken to prevent

recurrence. The record is not yet complete and definitive conclusions have not yet been reached.

The committee has no desire to anticipate what may be the findings, nor jump to any hasty opinions. We cannot overlook, however, our responsibilities to the people and to the Members of the House in the field of aviation operations and safety, as to what, if anything, should be done in the meantime. Accordingly, we are having these executive meetings so that we may be assured ourselves and in turn assure the Members that the proper measures have been and are being taken adequately to protect the public.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE NORTH-EAST POWER FAILURE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on the Investigation of the Northeast Power Failure be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANNED SPACE FLIGHT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Daddarol, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of the Committee on Science and Astronautics be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR ADMIRAL NIMITZ

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time first to advise the House that memorial services for Admiral Nimitz will be held in the Washington National Cathedral at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, February 25.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]	
Farnsley Fisher Hagan, Ga. Hagen, Calif. Hansen, Iowa Harvey, Ind. Hébert Jacobs Kee Martin, Ala. Matthews Miller	Powell Reuss Rivers, S.C. Roudebush Scott Smith, Iowa Taylor Teague, Tex. Toll Vigorito Walker, Miss. White, Idaho
Pool	Willis Zablocki
	Farnsley Fisher Hagan, Ga. Hagen, Calif. Hansen, Iowa Harvey, Ind. Hébert Jacobs Kee Martin, Ala. Matthews Miller Moorhead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed

SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSIST-ANCE AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 742, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 742

Resolved. That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the fiveminute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the rule on H.R. 12169 providing for 3 hours of debate.

H.R. 12169 will authorize the appropriation of \$415 million in supplemental funds for the economic assistance program of the Agency for International

Development during the remainder of fiscal year 1966.

This authorization is essential to carry forward U.S. efforts to resist Communist aggression in South Vietnam and elsewhere in southeast Asia and to build stability in the Dominican Republic. In addition, the authorization will replenish the contingency fund which provides funds to the President for use in unforeseen and emergency situations where vital U.S. interests are at stake.

H.R. 12169 provides \$315 million in new authority for supporting assistance, of which \$275 million is for Vietnam; \$15 million for Laos and Thailand; \$25 million for the Dominican Republic; and \$100 million for the contingency fund, for use in any part of the world where emergencies might arise.

There is a clear need for these funds. Appropriations now available for use in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are exhausted. The contingency fund is exhausted. In fact, AID has had to "borrow" from other funding categories to finance our efforts in Vietnam. These "borrowings" must be paid back.

I am assured by AID that there are no further sources of funds and, in fact, funds for Vietnam are dangerously low. Any delay or any cut in the authorization now before the House would seriously hinder our efforts to defeat the Communists in the crucial struggle for southeast Asia.

The \$275 million of supporting assistance for South Vietnam can be divided into two main elements. The first is \$175 million to finance commodity imports which will help to fight inflation. I think all my colleagues would agree rampant inflation poses a major threat to economic and political stability wherever it occurs. But in a war situation such as Vietnam, the effects are even more serious and an integral part of our program is designed to bring more goods into the economy to keep the forces of inflation in check.

The second major element of the program in Vietnam to be financed from the funds authorized in H.R. 12169 is \$100 million for counterinsurgency and rural construction. Included in these programs are public safety, logistic management, public works, refugee relief, agriculture and welfare, and development projects. As you can see from this brief listing, these funds will have a direct impact on the people of that wartorn land. These funds will support the outstanding work of the Agency for International Development in helping to build a better life and to give the Vietnamese hope for the future.

Approval of these funds will help support the military efforts in Vietnam and carry forward the pledge made in the declaration of Honolulu to win the crucial battle against disease, ignorance, and poverty in South Vietnam.

The expanded AID program in Vietnam entails increased administrative expenses. AID has estimated that approximately \$1.4 million will be required to meet recruitment costs and pay for other administrative and support services. Therefore, the committee has included authority to use up to \$1.4 million of supporting assistance funds for administrative expenses incurred only in connection with Vietnam programs. This authority would require a determination by the President that such a transfer is necessary, which determination would be reported to the Congress.

The bill before the House also contains \$15 million to support counterinsurgency and rural development efforts in Thailand and Laos. The battle for these areas of southeast Asia has been increasing in tempo in recent months. Communist subversion is being stepped

up and we must meet it.

H.R. 12169 thus will provide support for efforts to meet aggression and resist subversion in these key countries of southeast Asia—Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos. The funds being requested are small in comparison to our military efforts, but they are not less important.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House will help in the short-run struggle against communism and the long-run battle against the ancient enemies of

man.

As President Johnson said in his foreign aid message to the Congress:

We extend assistance to nations because it is in the highest traditions of our heritage and our humanity. But even more because we are concerned with the kind of world our children will live in.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 12169, which will provide one more step toward a world of stability, peace, and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule is adopted, and I would now like to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a point on the

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and for his explanation of the bill which is to be considered here, H.R. 12169, as made in order by House Resolution 742. My question pertains to the rules of procedure of the House and particularly to lines 6 and 7 of the resolution, where "all points of order against that bill are hereby waived."

Would the gentleman from Massachusetts advise me, in his wisdom and that of the Committee on Rules, what there is in this bill that might be subject to a point of order and, secondly, who made the request that this be included in this rule and, thirdly, why it is good procedure under these particular circum-

stances?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Actually, I do not know where a point of order lies. All I do know is it is the procedure of the Committee on Rules, when we have a rule to write we tell the Parliamentarian and he writes it for us, and we go on from there. I do not know whether there is a point of order that lies against the bill. As I recall it, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs said, having gone over the bill with the Parliamentarian, that he knew of no points of order but that they

thought it was best because of the importance of the bill that they waive points of order so, in case there is a technicality ruled against it, it would protect it.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. But, is the distinguished gentleman telling the House that the Committee on Rules does not write the rules under which we consider legislation in this House?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Of course, we have as an adviser on matters of this nature the Parliamentarian, as do all the Members of the House.

Mr. HALL. Is there any question in the gentleman's mind as to whether or not there is anything in this bill that is not germane? Was any point submitted that would require waiver of all points of order against the bill?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. No.

I would submit there was not.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a poor way to legislate. We have adequate rules of procedure which are updated every 2 years and which have been our rules since the time of Jefferson for the handling of matters pertaining to rules of germaneness, the Ramseyer rule, and every other indication that we ordinarily concern ourselves with concerning points of order. If they are to come in here, as they did indeed yesterday, when we had a protest vote against the rule requested by the Committee on Ways and Means, and, if all supplementals or deficiencies and appropriations come in with waivers of points of order and "gag rules" preventing amendment-and this is a perfectly good rule here except for the waiver of all points of order-there are bound to be objections, no action "without objection," and none will be considered under unanimous consent, and I place the House on notice that there will be protest votes all along.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. All I can say to the gentleman from Missouri is that to my knowledge there are no points of order in this legislation. However, the committee felt that the bill was of such import that it did not want to take any chances, and so the waiver of points of order was placed in the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand what the gentleman from Massachusetts is saying—this was inserted by the Parliamentarian or by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and it was passed routinely, without consideration by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. It was suggested by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. HALL. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is nothing in the bill itself that might be subject to a point of order?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. It was inserted by the Committee on Rules at the suggestion of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. HALL. Well, Mr. Speaker, the House in its wisdom can determine later whether the bill contains areas therein and whether it might be subject to a point of order. But with this resolution passing as written we have no right to work our will under these circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman presently in the well of the House, and the Committee on Rules, am I to believe now that it is becoming fashionable to simply write waivers of points of order in the rules clearing bills to the House floor?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. There was a request that this be done.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, is it just fashionable to do it?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Iowa was in the Committee on Rules when the debate transpired yesterday. The gentleman was there, and he knows that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs asked for this particular rule, after he had talked with the Parliamentarian. At that time the gentleman could have, if he so desired, opposed the rule and the granting of the waiving of points of order that the gentleman's chairman offered before the Committee on Rules, but the gentleman sat there mute.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, let us get the record straight. I sat immediately back of the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania said he did not know of any reason why points of order should be waived on the bill, and I thought that was sufficient.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. But, nevertheless, he asked for this rule.

Mr. GROSS. Who is "he" who asked for a waiver of points of order?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan]. I presume he was speaking for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Who is "he"? The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee? The chairman of that committee said that he was not asking that the points of order be waived.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. But Dr. Morgan explained to us that he had requested the rule that was suggested to him, after he had consultation with the Parliamentarian. For that reason he was offering that rule, and that is why we adopted it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not know when that happened, and I insist he did not make such a request. If there is a rollcall vote on the rule I will vote against adoption for the reason that no case has been made for a waiver of points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 742 provides for a 3-hour rule for the consideration of H.R. 12169, which is a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of

1961. It does waive points of order, but

it is open for amendment.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, authorizes the appropriation or \$415 million for the remainder of fiscal 1966 to support U.S. operations in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic, and to build up the contingency fund. None of the money is for military assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the funds are intended for the following purposes: \$275 million for Vietnam, \$7.5 million for Laos, \$7.5 for Thailand, \$25 million for the Dominican Republic, and \$100 million for the contingency fund, which makes a

total of \$415 million.

Mr. Speaker, of these funds for Vietnam, \$175 million will be used to import essential consumer goods and industrial materials required to keep the economy going. The remaining \$100 million is for the rebuilding of war-damaged villages, roads and bridges, increased refugee relief, and to finance increased counterinsurgency operations.

Mr. Speaker, the \$7.5 million for Laos will be used to finance a civilian air transport to outlying areas cut off from direct government contact, and to pur-chase the supplies carried in by the air-

lift.

Mr. Speaker, the \$7.5 million ear-marked for Thailand is to be used to expand programs aimed at strengthening the exposed northeast area against Communist subversion from neighboring Laos just across the Mekong River. Training of local police improved communications and expanded health, education, and agriculture programs are planned.

Mr. Speaker, the bill provides \$25 million for the Dominican Republic. sum of \$15 million will be used to help finance the Government and the remaining \$10 million is earmarked to continue such projects as road repairs, community development, and irrigation

programs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes \$100 million to be added to the contingency fund for use in the last 3 months of fiscal 1966. The funds are to meet unexpected needs, not known ones, or programs Congress has previously rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of

the rule.

I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I do not have any requests for time but do reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to order the previous question.

The motion was agreed to.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks previously made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I was going to object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum was not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had declared the resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet and I want to object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to be fair and wants to protect the rights of Members. Since the gentleman states that he was on his feet for that purpose, without objection the actions by which the resolution was agreed to and the motion to reconsider was laid on the table are vacated.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were-yeas 360, nays 11, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 221 YEAS-360

Abbitt Abernethy Adair Adams Boland Collier Bolling Colmer Bolton Conable Bow Conte Brademas Conyers Addabbo Albert Brav Corbett Anderson, Ill. Brock Craley Anderson, Brooks Cramer Broomfield Tenn. Brown, Ohio Broyhill, N.C. Broyhill, Va. Cunningham Andrews. George W. Curtin Andrews, N. Dak Curtis Buchanan Daddario Dague Annunzio Burke Burton, Calif. Burton, Utah Daniels Arends Davis, Ga. Davis, Wis. de la Garza Ashmore Byrne, Pa. Byrnes, Wis. Cabell Aspinall Ayres Baldwin Delaney Baring Barrett Cahill Dent Callan Denton Bates Battin Callaway Derwinski Cameron Devine Beckworth Carey Diggs Carter Belcher Dingell Celler Bell Dole Bennett Donohue Chamberlain Berry Betts Clancy Dow Clark Clawson, Del Downing Dulski Bingham Clevenger Duncan, Oreg. Boggs

Ellsworth Erlenborn Evans, Colo. Everett Evins, Tenn. Fallon Farbstein Farnum Fascell. Feighan Findley Flynt Ford William D. Fountain Friedel Fulton, Pa. Fuqua Gallagher Garmatz Gathings Giaimo Gibbons Gilbert Gilligan Gonzalez Grav Green, Oreg. Green, Pa. Greigg Grider Griffin Griffiths Hagen, Calif. Haley Halpern Hamilton Hardy Harsha Harvey, Mich. Hathaway Hawkins Hechler Helstoski Henderson Herlong Hicks Holland Hosmer Hull Hungate Huot Hutchinson Ichord Jacobs Jarman Jennings Jonas Jones, Ala. Jones, Mo. Jones, N.C. Karsten Karth Kastenmeier Keith Kelly Keogh King, Calif. King, N.Y. King, Utah

Kornegay Edmondson Edwards, Ala. Edwards, Calif. Fogarty Foley Ford, Gerald R. Frelinghuysen Hanley Hansen, Idaho Hansen, Wash. Joelson Johnson, Calif. Johnson, Okla. Johnson, Pa. Reinecke

Duncan, Tenn. Kluczynski

Dwyer

Kunkel Kupferman Laird Langen Latta Leggett Lennon Lipscomb Long, La. Love McCarthy McClory McCulloch McDade McDowell McEwen McFall McGrath McMillan McVicker Macdonald MacGregor Machen Mackay Mackie Madden Mahon Mailliard Marsh Martin, Ala. Martin, Mass. Martin, Nebr. Mathias Matsunaga May Meeds Michel Mills Minish Mink Minshall Mize Moeller Monagan Moore Morgan Morris Morrison Morse Morton Mosher Murphy, Ill. Murphy, N.Y. Murray Natcher Nedzi Nelsen Nix O'Brien O'Hara, Ill. O'Hara, Mich. O'Konski Olsen, Mont. O'Neal, Ga. O'Neill, Mass. Ottinger Patman Patten Pelly Perkins Philbin Pickle Pike Pirnie Poage Poff Price Pucinski Quie Race Randall Redlin Rees Reid, Ill Reid, N.Y.

Reuss Rhodes, Ariz. Rhodes, Pa. Rivers Alaska Roberts Robison Rodino Rogers, Colo. Rogers, Fla. Ronan Roncalio Rooney, N.Y. Rooney, Pa. Rosenthal Rostenkowski Roush Roybal Rumsfeld Ryan Satterfield St Germain St. Onge Scheuer Schisler Schmidhauser Schneebeli Schweiker Secrest Selden Shipley Shriver Sickles Sikes Sisk Skubitz Slack Smith, Calif. Smith, N.Y. Smith, Va. Springer Stafford Staggers Stalbaum Stanton Steed Stephens Stratton Stubblefield Sullivan Sweeney Talcott Taylor Teague, Calif. Tenzer Thompson, N.J. Thompson, Tex. Thomson, Wis. Todd Trimble Tuck Tunney Tupper Tuten Udall Ullman Utt Van Deerlin Vanik Vivian Waggonner Walker, N. Mex. Watkins Weltner Whalley White, Tex. Whitener Whitten Williams Wilson, Bob Wolff Wright Wvatt Wydler Yates Young Younger

NAYS-11

Andrews, Glenn Ashbrook Dickinson Gross Pool Gurney Hall Passman

NOT VOTING-

Ashley Casey Bandstra Cederberg Blatnik Brown, Calif. Clausen Burleson Don H.

Quillen

Cleveland Cohelan Cooley Dawson

Purcell Harvey, Ind. Dorn Hays Hébert Resnick Dowdy Rivers, S.C. Dyal Edwards, La. Hollfield Roudebush Scott Farnsley Irwin Senner Smith, Iowa Kirwan Fisher Teague, Tex. Fulton, Tenn. Landrum Toll Long, Md. Matthews Goodell Vigorito Walker, Miss. White, Idaho Willis Grabowski Miller Grover Gubser Moorhead Multer Olson, Minn. Hagan, Ga. Wilson, Charles H. Hanna Pepper Powell Zablocki Hansen, Iowa

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following

Mr. Miller with Mr. Grover. Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Ceder-

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Fino. Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Walker of Mississippi, Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Olson of Minnesota. Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Chelf with Mr Irwin.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Ashley. Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Casey. Mr. Pepper with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Long of Maryland.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Teague of Texas. Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Vigorito with Hr. Hansen of Iowa.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Farnsley. Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Powell. Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Resnick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-BERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12169, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan] will be recognized for 11/2 hours and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BoL-TON] will be recognized for 11/2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12169 authorizes \$415 million of additional funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Most of this money is for Vietnam, and I believe it is fair to say that if it were not for the war in Vietnam, we would not have this bill before us.

Now I know that there are some of us who disagree with the policy our Government is following in Vietnam, but I do not believe that even those who disagree with our policy will find themselves in opposition to this bill.

As far as I am aware, none of the critics of our policy has advocated an immediate pullout of U.S. forces and termination of U.S. assistance.

I believe everyone will agree that as long as our boys are fighting in Vietnam, we must back them up, and, although this bill provides no military assistance, the funds which it authorizes are absolutely essential if the civilian population is to cope with the devastation of war and the demoralization caused by inflation in that country.

The funds authorized by this bill are to

be used as follows:

For Vietnam \$275,000,000 For Laos 7,500,000 For Thailand ... For the Dominican Republic ... 25, 000, 000 To replenish the contingency

100,000,000

Total____ 415,000,000

VIETNAM

It is not necessary for me to describe the effect which the war has had on the economy of Vietnam. Villages, roads, and bridges have been destroyed. Crops have been damaged and the movement of rice to markets has been interrupted. The Government is not able to collect its normal revenues, and it needs more money than ever to carry on the war effort.

This bill authorizes funds to assist the rural population to deal with war devastation and to finance the import of additional supplies of very essential commodities. The sale of these commodities will absorb some of the rapidly expanding purchasing power resulting from the presence of U.S. personnel and the large-scale construction program made necessary to supply and to shelter our forces in that country.

At the same time, the proceeds of the sale of these commodities will augment the war budget of the Government of

As I pointed out a minute ago, there is no money in this bill for military assistance. The organization and procedures of the military assistance program are not designed to support combat operations. The Committee on Foreign Affairs agrees with the recommendation of the President that the supply of military equipment and services to the Vietnam forces should be at the discretion of our commander in the field and that the same logistics system should serve both United States and Vietnam forces while this present war is going on. Authorization of the funds to finance military equipment for the use of our own forces in Vietnam and for the Vietnamese forces is now under consideration by the Committee on Armed Services.

Just yesterday morning I appeared before the Committee on Rules at the same time the Armed Forces representatives appeared, and a rule was granted on their bill. I am sure under the leadership of the House, it will be up for discussion next week.

LAOS

The \$7,500,000 for Laos is needed primarily to meet the problems of supplying the civilian population of that wartorn country. There are a considerable number of refugees who have to be taken care of, and many villages inhabited by people who are strongly anti-Communist are cut off except for air transport. The United States finances civilian air transport to supply these people and the expansion of airport facilities in order to carry the load.

THATLAND

The Communist campaign of terrorism and subversion in Thailand has been accelerated, particularly in the northeast and the extreme south. The \$7,500,000 provided for Thailand is to finance the expansion of the civil police, including additional helicopters and a village radio network, and to extend the rural development program to more villages.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The funds authorized in the bill will provide \$25 million for the Dominican Republic. Most of it will go to pay salaries and other expenses to keep government services going until the revenues of the Government of the Dominican Republic can be restored, and the rest to finance such essential economic programs as road maintenance, repair of irrigation ditches, and community development.

CONTINGENCY FUND

The large item in this bill that is not programed is the contingency fund.

The bill authorizes \$100 million to replenish the contingency fund. Last summer, the President requested and Congress voted \$50 million for the contingency fund. This was the first time in 10 years that the Executive had asked for less than \$150 million for the contingency fund, although in some years the actual drawings on the contingency fund were substantially lower.

The \$50 million has not been enough to meet the demands on the contingency fund this year. It has all been programed, and the bill provides \$100 million to take care of unforeseen situations or to deal with problems which are known to exist but where the amount of money required cannot yet be determined

The Congress has established the policy, which is accepted by the Executive. that the contingency fund will not be used to finance projects or operations which are already programed or for which Congress has refused to provide funds

There is no way we can tell whether \$100 million will be enough or whether it will be too much. The Agency for International Development has in recent years made a good record of returning to the Treasury any unneeded portion of the contingency fund.

The committee believes that, considering the present world situation, it

is in the national interest to provide the full amount requested, with the understanding that if all the money is not needed, it will not be spent.

The expanded Vietnam program has increased the cost of administration to pay the salaries of additional personnel. to meet the cost of recruiting the limited number of people with the necessary qualifications who are available for service in Vietnam and provide the necessary office space, equipment, and rental of quarters.

Section 610(b) of existing law prohibits the use of the transfer authority or other discretionary authority contained in the Foreign Assistance Act to augment appropriations for administrative expenses. For this reason, an additional authorization is required for this purpose, and the bill makes \$1,400,000 available for such use.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is very, very important to our effort in South Vietnam. As I said before, no military assistance is provided in the bill, but it is important to carry on our effort there. I hope that the House will pass the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentle-

man from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that this money is being requested and authorized on an "illustrative" basis, in that if the administration does not need this money for southeast Asia, it could be allocated to and spent in any other country in any part of the world where we have an AID program or even in countries where we do not have an AID program at the present time?

Mr. MORGAN. I am sure if the gentleman from Louisiana will read the hearings conducted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, he will find that the President has already had to draw on funds temporarily unused to the amount of \$64 million to keep the program going. The money in this bill will have to replace what has already been drawn and spent. The money is actually needed right now.

Mr. PASSMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's response; but is it not true that this money in this bill is being requested on an "illustrative" basis, and that it is not earmarked for South Vietnam or any other country? It is not like all other foreign aid: It is on an "illustrative" basis and may be spent wherever the AID agency pleases? If it is not true, please point out where in this bill you have earmarked money for South Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. I have already pointed out to the gentleman from Louisiana that \$64 million is earmarked to replace funds already spent.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is that provision in this bill?

Mr. MORGAN. It has already been spent.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is there such a provision in this bill?

Mr. MORGAN. It has been explained in the hearings.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am talking about this specific bill. The program is on an "illustrative" basis. I have been handling the appropriations bill for this pro-

gram for a long, long time, and it is still on an "illustrative" basis. Funds in the annual appropriation and in this bill are not earmarked for any particular country. Also the contingency fund of \$100 million can be used in any country around the world. In fact, AID testified before my subcommittee that they may not need it and may not spend it. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman,

will the gentleman yield? Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentle-

man from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the chairman for yielding to me. Is it not a fact that the appropriation bill considered by the gentleman from Louisiana is also on an illustrative basis and that it does give transferability author-

Mr. MORGAN. This particular authorization has been justified on the basis that the need exists in South Vietnam and in the neighboring countries of Laos and Thailand.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I always seem to get this monstrosity of a program through the House on that basis. But when you, the authorization committee, make it legal to appropriate on an illustrative basis, we have no other alternative other than to go along with such a flexible procedure.

This is just another piece of the giveaway program. If you earmark these funds for South Vietnam, I will vote for it and apologize to this House for making this statement. You are not going to earmark these funds, and AID will have the right to spend it wherever they please

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman, who has not always been a supporter of the program, has not been able to earmark it down through the years, I believe that what we must do is trust the administration now, as we have in the past.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman has made my point for me. I want to thank him for it. We understand it is not earmarked, and you have no assurance that 15 cents of it will be spent in South Vietnam, so far as the language of the bill is concerned.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman's own bill is always set up on an illustrative basis. I believe the chairman made a point that the money has already been borrowed from other areas in order to fund the activities in South Vietnam.

Mr. PASSMAN. I read the hearings, and I still do not know where the money has been spent. It is the same old cab-

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that if the contingency fund in the amount of \$100 million is approved it can be spent in Indonesia or on behalf

of Nasser or Sukarno, or in any other place around the world?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman understands the definition of "contingency fund." Of course, it can be used anywhere there are unforeseen emergencies. anywhere around the world. The gentleman knows, as I know, that in the bill of last year we established a special contingency fund for South Vietnam in the amount of \$89 million. It has all been allocated to that area. This is the reason why none of the \$50 million from the contingency fund was used in South Vietnam. The gentleman can be sure, without that special contingency fund for South Vietnam, the \$50 million would have been used in South Vietnam.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today presents a very serious question for many people, including myself, who have been critical of our foreign aid programs for many years. If this bill is to be supported—and I think it should be-it should be supported on the basis of the fact that we are in Vietnam. Whether we like it or not, we are there. If we are there, we should provide every resource, every facility for our fighting men there.

It may be said, perhaps, that in this bill we are being overgenerous. I think we are. In my judgment there is a place where this bill can be reduced and should be reduced. But we must not err on the side of denying any dollars to the activity in Vietnam which will lead to its speedier conclusion and may in any sense result in the saving of lives. Upon that sober basis, I think this legislation should be considered.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is not perfect. It is not without fault. It does not do many of the things that ought to be done. It leaves unanswered certain questions.

However, it is a step in the right direction and possibly, only possibly, the best step that we can take at this time. There are areas about which several of us on the committee who filed supplemental views were deeply concerned. First of all, we are concerned that ships of friendly nations, ships of countries to which we have given assistance, are even now continuing to carry goods and cargoes into North Vietnam, into the harbor at Haiphong. We feel something should be done about that, something far more than has been done and is being done.

Secondly, although we did not go into this in the supplemental views, we are aware that great delays are being encountered in the offloading of cargos at Saigon and Da Nang and elsewhere. think this is inexcusable. If, during World War II, we could, by the use of breakwaters and otherwise, unload fantastic amounts of cargo and great numbers of men onto the Normandy beaches in a combat situation, then there is absolutely no excuse, Mr. Chairman, for the fact that cargo ships are lined up waiting to be offloaded in Saigon and elsewhere in Vietnam. This, I say, is inexcusable.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, everyone who has visited Vietnam comes back with reports that there is a black market there. Admittedly, in a wartime economy, it is difficult to stop black-market operations, but if they cannot be stopped entirely, at least they can be limited. We who filed supplemental views suggested a means by which this could be done. We suggested that all civilian dependents be sent home. There are no civilian dependents there now of U.S. Government personnel, military and civilian, but there are some contractors' civilian dependents there. We have reason to believe that if these dependents were sent home, at least one type of black-market operation would be curtailed, if indeed not done away with completely.

Reference has been made to the contingency fund. For this fiscal year there was provided \$50 million, which was all committed or at least earmarked in the first 7 months of the fiscal year, none of

it for Vietnam.

At the request of the President, special funds for southeast Asia were made available which were or are being used in Vietnam. Now we are asked to provide another \$100 million in contingency funds for the balance of this fiscal year. At the maximum this will only be 4 months. I think that is far too much. In a period when we are tightening our belts and we are trying to continue programs here at home and do a great deal for people abroad the contingency fund should be and can be severely limited. I am sure that an opportunity will be offered to the Members of this House to do SO.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude as I began by saying that although this bill before us is one which presents many questions and raises many doubts and leaves issues unanswered, if we take the position that the war in Vietnam must be won, if we take the position that we cannot deny anything which will contribute either directly or indirectly to victory there, then I think we must support this bill.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. I yield to the gen-

tleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for his very excellent statement as to his reasons for supporting this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of

H.R. 12169.

I fail to see how Congress could do otherwise, any more than it could fail to authorize payment of the water bill for the fire department while it was in the midst of attempting to stamp out dangerous fires in many parts of the city.

The bill before us today is emergency legislation. It is designed to authorize the expenditure of \$415 million in tax dollars, most of it to be spent in the short space of the next 4 months, in order to repair the damages caused in many parts of the world by ignorance, by unconcern, by miscalculation and misunderstanding.

It even provides an additional \$100 million for our \$50 million "petty cash drawer" in case dollars are needed to

sprinkle on other brush fires which might erupt in any part of the world.

I am sure that the Congress will enact this bill into law rapidly, as it should. This money is needed, and quickly, in such places as South Vietnam, Laos, the Dominican Republic and Thailand.

But throwing dollars at our problems is not a solution to them, no matter how many dollars we have and however tempting this solution may appear. The best that dollars can buy is time. The worst is complacency and the failure to even see problems as they develop.

We need more fire prevention as well as fire control in the world, and we can't have it unless and until we start using these dollars as tools to implement foreign policy rather than as replacements

for a foreign policy.

Unfortunately, the funds we are authorizing today are not tools, not implements, but payments for mistakes. Let us hope we have fewer of them in the

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. Will the gentleman in the well please give me a few hypothetical illustrations on which this money from the \$100 million contingency fund could

be spent?

Mr. ADAIR. I think the chairman of the committee answered that a little earlier I could only use generally the same illustrations. A contingency fund is, as its name implies, a fund to be used for unseen eventualities. We in the Congress and particularly in the House and those of us on the Committee on Foreign Affairs have been in the past-and I count myself among those-particularly critical of the way that the contingency fund can be used, but there are-and I will say to the gentleman very few-limitations, as long as it falls within the broadest outlines of foreign aid, on the manner in which this fund can be used. It can be used for situations which arise, for example, in a country which is newly threatened with revolt. It can be used for problems which present themselves in the field of education or matters of that sort. It is subject to the very widest use.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentleman. Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman

from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman heard the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for foreign aid. Is it accurate that these funds are not tied down or that this authorization of funds is not tied down to

Mr. ADAIR. It is true that by the terms of this bill it is not tied down to Vietnam nor indeed to southeast Asia.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, could I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. ADAIR. Let me continue. However, if you read the record of the hearings, and if you consult the report, there is no question as to the intent. Since the gentleman has opened the question let me state that we are acting upon

this as a measure apart from some money for the Dominican Republic, a measure basically for southeast Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Accordingly, I would think that the administration which has presented it to the Congress in that way as a measure to contribute to stability in southeast Asia would feel bound to use it for that pur-

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, why would not the administration have this in this

Mr. ADAIR. That is a question which the gentleman, I believe, should address to the author of the bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman,

will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am quite interested in this question.

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am very happy to point out that of the money which has been earmarked, \$275 million of this request has been justified on the basis of its need in South Vietnam.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further, yes, but-no, no, if I could interrupt there just a minute. You are not responsive to the issue. You say 'earmarked," and that struck my interest.

But then you go on, as has just been talked about, and say something else. I want to find out why it is not actually tied down and actually earmarked by language, and not on the basis of just these statements.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will yield further, it has never been earmarked in such fashion in any of the history of the foreign aid bill. During the history of the foreign aid bill it has never been specifically earmarked.

Mr. CURTIS. I know, and that is one of the troubles with this bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Or any other appropriation.

Mr. MORGAN. Or in the appropriation bill. The gentleman from Missouri wants to change the rules on matters of this kind.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I believe that is one reason our foreign aid programs have been so poor, if I may draw that conclusion. Certainly, to come here at a time when we are in war over there, and say that this is for Vietnam and if you expect to get the vote on the assurance that that is what it is, I certainly believe that this rule should be changed and we should tie it down.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if I will vote for this unless it is tied down, because I have seen instances in these programs and I am about to conclude that the administration does not follow what it says in those examples which it gives as to where the money is to be spent. We could not rely upon this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes. I say in response to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri that it is my understanding we will have an opportunity to connect these more closely and explicitly with Vietnam and southeast Asia.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, will a possible amendment be offered?

Mr. ADAIR. I understand that such is

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to develop one other point, if I may. I was trying to find—and I have not had an opportunity to look through all of the hearings, although I have read the report—I was interested in seeing what balances we have not just in the foreign aid funds, but Public Law 480 funds, and how this money that we recently voted for the Asian Bank, which I hope will be available particularly in Vietnam, how this is coordinated. But I find no discussion of it contained in the report. As I stated earlier, insofar as I have been able to ascertain from the report, and I have not read the hearings, there has been no interrogation on this point.

Could the gentleman tell me whether the committee did go into all aspects of financing that is available in Vietnam, not just through this bill, but through the use of Public Law 480 funds, the lending that might be available in the Asian

Bank, and so forth?

Mr. ADAIR. Having in mind the great multiplicity of lending institutions that are available for activities here and elsewhere, I would have to say to the gentleman, it would be almost impossible to go into all of them. Some of them do not even come within the purview of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We did give some consideration—perhaps not enough—to the general subject.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would permit me to make this observation before he yields further, it seems to me that is what we would expect the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do even though it is not within their jurisdiction—at least to have a knowledge of the funds that would be going in to hit at the same problem so at least there would be some consensus of this whole problem that the House could consider.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I vield to the gentleman. Mr. GALLAGHER. There is a complete report on all of the expenditures available for all Members. But if I might follow up what the gentleman from Indiana has already said and nail it down, we are talking about funds primarily to be used in Vietnam. For instance, the \$100 million of this request is for additional economic assistance that will be used for rural construction and counterinsurgency activities. AID needs \$175 million for Vietnam to help finance the import of essential commodities in order to help combat inflation

Rice imports needs \$21 million.

Medicines and pharmaceuticals requires \$9 million.

Needed for petroleum products, \$12 million.

Needed for iron and steel, \$50 million. Needed for fertilizer imports, \$4.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, over half of these commodities will be utilized in areas outside of Saigon. All of the \$275 million is pinpointed for use in Vietnam.

Mr. CURTIS. In what way is this tied down? This is simply a statement. How can the Congress know that this actually is the way this money will be spent?

Mr. GALLAGHER. We would assume, of course, that the administration is telling the truth, as we have during all the time that we have had this program in operation.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further just for this observation, that is the whole point that the gentleman from Louisiana made, as I understand it, and to the extent that I have been able to study this matter of expenditures, the administration—and this is not just this administration, it was true in the Eisenhower administration as well

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. There was not this kind of followthrough on how they spent the money.

Mr. GALLAGHER. There has been that kind of followthrough and that is why we have confidence that the money will be properly used.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, the gentleman is saying that he feels I am in error in concluding that there has not been a followthrough?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes; I would conclude that the gentleman is in error if he says that there has not been a follow-through on this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] raised the question of committee consideration of the Southeast Asian Development Bank. That was subsequent to the hearings held by the committee on this bill. Moreover, we are never consulted by the Committee on Banking and Currency, so far as I know, with respect to financing any of these wonderful giveaways around the world that they get into.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman

from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman tell us whether or not there is any existing statutory authority at the present time to permit the President or someone to order the dependents of the U.S. citizens back home?

Mr. ADAIR. The President in my opinion has the authority. I think there is no doubt about it. It has been exercised, I am told, in a number of in-

Mr. CAHILL. Can the gentleman advance any logical reason as to why this authority would be utilized as far as military personnel are concerned and not so far as civilian dependents are concerned.

Mr. ADAIR. Not at all. That is the point I was trying to make earlier and I appreciate the gentleman's concurrence in my views.

Mr. CAHILL. I think the gentleman is making an excellent point. One of the things that I have observed is that there is a tremendous housing shortage in Saigon particularly. I think this is one of the elements involved in the black market and certainly it is something that needs looking into. I think the gentleman has made a very valuable contribution to the discussion of these problems.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

win the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to point out that all civilian personnel of the Government have been ordered home. The only civilian personnel remaining there, or family of personnel, are the wives and families of the private contractors who are there.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for his constructive criticism. I have always had a great deal of respect for his position in this regard and for his sincere endeavor. I would like to ask the gentleman a question at this point. Is it not true that the criticism that you have brought out on the floor at this time regarding civilian dependents and supplies was thoroughly discussed by us in the consideration of this bill and that at the present time we have the statements to the effect that the supplies have been speeded up and that we might take up the problem of civilian dependents?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentlewoman is correct. Efforts are being made. My point is that they are tardy and far too little. If we can get cargoes across beaches under combat conditions, I see no reason why we cannot do the same in areas where there is no danger of aerial attack.

Mrs. KELLY. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I think we sometimes tend to forget, when we talk about AID appropriations, and funding, and economic development, and all the other technical jargon, that at the grassroots, out where the action is, the AID program means people at work—dedicated people; people with a job to do; people who get tired and scared and shot at, and worried, and who keep right on doing their jobs the best way they can. I would like to tell you about just one of these men I met during my recent trip to Vietnam.

I spent 1 day in the Mekong Delta with the U.S. operations mission there. I could not get in the area I was supposed to visit because they were afraid for my safety. The man running that area was Eduardo Navarro.

Eduardo Navarro is a retired U.S. Army colonel. He knows how to use a gun if he has to but he does not carry one. He is a civilian working for the Agency for International Development as a Provincial representative in Vietnam near the Cambodian border. He is concerned with the welfare of 250,000 Vietnamese in an area infested with Vietcong. After being ambushed several times on the road to Saigon, he finally gave up driving. He has had several narrow escapes from daytime bombings in the streets of the city.

The villagers regard Ed Navarro as their friend. He works closely with the Province chief and American and Vietnamese military personnel to improve life in the Province while maintaining the best possible security. About 30 of his villages are considered secure and have qualified for Government help by routing out the Vietcong and agreeing to

carry out self-help projects.

He is proud of the more than 100 schools which have been built by the village parents with cement and roofing supplied by AID. Nearly 200 teachers have been trained in short courses. Several clinics have been built and stocked with medical supplies from the AID commodity import program. Occasionally, the Vietcong steal them but the people know where they come from.

He uses his warehouse of food-forpeace wheat, oils, and dried milk as payment for work to benefit the community and make life worth fighting for.

On a demonstration farm 2 miles out of town, production is being increased by use of fertilizer and new seed. The Provincial hospital has a new surgical wing built by AID, staffed by a team of Filipino doctors and nurses paid by their own Government.

In fact, no aspect of life is overlooked. All the resources of AID in Vietnam are available to Eduardo Navarro to help the Vietnamese people build a better life. Not many Americans will ever hear of Ed Navarro or of his counterparts in every Vietnamese Province. But we in the Congress must not only know of what they are doing, we must support them. Perhaps this war cannot be won by civilians armed with seed, cement, and goodwill, but neither can it be won without them.

I believe the budget requests for AID are minimal and I call for their speedy approval.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would address a question to the chairman of the committee, if I might have his attention. This bill, as I understand it, and as I believe the Members of the House understand it, is to provide additional funds for economic aid to the Vietnamese and contiguous territory, plus \$25 million for the Dominican Republic.

Mr. MORGAN. Plus \$100 million for the contingency fund.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. But is not the bill designed for the purpose of aid to Viet-

nam? There is nothing whatever for the military effort.

Mr. MORGAN. Seventy percent of the funds in the bill are designed to support the war effort in South Vietnam.

Mr. GROSS. Then why should we be dealing in this supplemental with any other areas other than those enumerated in the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. We are not. That is my opinion. I understand that all of the supplemental appropriations requested in this bill are for areas that are of vital importance to the security of this country.

Mr. GROSS. Will not the distinguished chairman agree with me that there is nothing whatever in the language of this bill that holds its provisions to Vietnam or any other specific place in the world?

Mr. MORGAN. As the gentleman knows, this is a supplemental authorization and is an amendment to the regular foreign aid bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes: it is an addition to

the regular foreign handout.

Mr. MORGAN. This is the procedure. Any other method would require us to bring out a separate AID bill for South Vietnam. Is that what the gentleman is suggesting? This is an amendment to the regular AID bill.

Mr. GROSS. I think a substantial number of the Members of the House are willing to vote for a bill today supplementing the foreign aid appropriations where such funds are designated for the purpose of doing something about aiding and bringing about a successful conclusion of the Vietnamese situation and sorry state of affairs in the Dominican Republic. It will be my purpose later on to offer an amendment to the bill to restrict the expenditures to those areas. It will be my further purpose to move to strike out all of the contingency fund increase, and I will argue that point later. because as the supplementary views in the report clearly show, not one dime of the \$50 million previously appropriatedand this was the statement of the distinguished chairman before the Rules Committee yesterday—was used in Vietnam. So it is incredible that we should be called upon today to provide \$100 million to beef up the contingency fund when we are dealing with a bill specifically designed to take care of the situations in the Dominican Republic, in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it the gentleman's intention, on Tuesday next, when H.R. 12335 comes to the House, containing approximately \$4 billion for military use in southeast Asia planning, to do the same thing and to pinpoint it in the same

Mr. GROSS. There is a great difference between military assistance and the giveaway program.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not believe there It is all part of the same thing.

Mr. GROSS. Especially when the giveaway program can go to any country in the world under the terms of this billto any country in the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it the gentleman's intention to pinpoint each item in the military authorization for Vietnam?

Mr. GROSS. Surely the gentleman is not trying to compare military assistance with this bill, which happens to come from the committee of which I am a member. I know a little something about this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is making an argument about the economic portion of the bill, but I still would like to have an answer to my question in regard to military funds authorized for the same area.

Mr. GROSS. I happen to know something about this bill. I am not a member of the Armed Services Committee and. therefore, I cannot say that I know as much about military assistance needs in the areas covered by this bill.

Does the gentleman know about the military bill? I shall be glad to support amendments, if the gentleman will offer them, with regard to military assistance, if he can find anyplace where we are going to give military assistance to anyone outside the southeast Asia area unless that country is fighting in Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has no intention to offer amendments. What I am trying to say to you, Mr. Gross, is that I have confidence in my President. When he says he is going to spend \$275 million in Vietnam I have confidence that he is going to spend it in Vietnam.

Mr. GROSS. Then suppose you tell me what happened to the \$50 million in the contingency fund which was expended last year? Suppose you tell me where the President is going to use the \$100 million in 120 days or less. Suppose you give me some idea as to that.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Gross, there was a contingency fund every year of the Eisenhower administration and every year since, and not one dime of this authorization has ever been programed in advance. If you will allow me the time, I will read that information into the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. No; the gentleman controls ample time for that.

Mr. MORGAN. As to all of the expenses since 1956.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute, now. You have ample time or time of your

Mr. MORGAN. And not one dime out of the contingency fund has been programed. You know the definition of "contingency fund" and I know it. It is for unforeseen emergencies.

I do not know today where one dime of this money is going to be spent, and I do not believe the administration does.

Mr. GROSS. We put \$50 million into the contingency fund last year.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; and I know where every dime of it was spent. So do you.

Mr. GROSS. Let us get it in the RECORD.

Mr. MORGAN. You know and I know that security is involved, and we cannot introduce it in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. Much of it ought to go in the RECORD. Much of it should not be classified. It should be made available to the people who pay the bills.

Mr. MORGAN. You know very well that it cannot be put in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. You know that there is plenty of it that ought to be put in the RECORD.

I believe we ought to take a look at the help we are not getting in Vietnam these days, along with the tremendous expenditure of money we are making and being called upon to make under the terms of this bill.

So far as I know, there are only three countries—Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea—which are supplying any combat troops at all. New Zealand is supplying one battery of artillery. Australia is supplying a battalion of combat troops. And South Korea, on the basis of the last information I have is supplying a division of combat troops.

I have not seen any figures with regard to casualties of Koreans. I suppose they are engaged somewhere in Victnam, but the newspapers do not provide us with the casualty figures insofar as the Koreans, the Australians, and the New

Zealanders are concerned.

Otherwise they are deeply gratified—as Henry Cabot Lodge said when he appeared before the committee not too long ago—the other countries of the world are deeply gratified that we are doing the fighting and dying in Vietnam, along with the South Vietnamese.

Let us consider the Philippines, for instance. At present the Philippines have 70 personnel in Vietnam. These consist of military and civilian medical teams and a military psychological warfare detachment. Would one not believe that the Philippines could make some kind of combat contribution to the war in Vietnam, to some of the fighting and

dying going on over there?

Japan has provided over \$55 million worth of economic assistance to Vietnam. This is money. We are talking about money exclusively now. This is reparations money they owe the Vietnamese as a result of their defeat in World War II that they would pay under any circumstances. Yet the State Department has the colossal gall to hand out a statement of this kind indicating that the Japanese are making a contribution in Vietnam when they give them \$55 million of money which they owe them as reparations for damage when they occupied the country in the last war.

You talk about having confidence in people. Let us have a decent and a fair story from some of these people in the State Department and in the White

House.

Greece has contributed medical supplies. I do not know how much. This is the State Department report which says Greece has contributed medical supplies. I hope it is remembered that we put a lot of money into Greece in other years, yet we get no real help in stopping communism elsewhere.

Turkey has provided medicines and has also offered to provide some cement.

Some cement—no troops.

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Vietnam and has dispatched a medical team.

Hundreds of millions of American dollars are going into India, a country that had 5 million or more under arms in World War II yet it will not provide a single combat soldier to help us out in Vietnam. India has provided cloth for flood relief, says the State Department, and has under study the creation in Vietnam of a factory for the preparation of tea and another for sugar so they will have tea with their sugar and sugar with their tea. This is within the framework of a program of technical assistance and economic cooperation. India is also considering providing equipment for what? For a blood transfusion center. They do not offer to give any blood, but will provide the center for somebody else to give their blood. How nice. Pakistan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes. Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me the additional time.

Pakistan has contributed some financial relief for flood victims, and it, too, donated some clothing to Vietnam. No troops.

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies and has offered to train Vietnamese in Israel in various fields, whatever that means. No troops.

Belgium provided medicines. How much? The State Department does not

say. No troops.

Canada is providing a professor of orthopedics at Saigon University. A big help. Also about 200 scholarships both academic and technical. They are also providing about \$150,000 worth of flour. If I remember correctly, Canada has been selling about \$400 million worth of wheat a year to Red China, but they cannot afford to get into Vietnam on a bloodletting basis. So, no troops. I almost forgot—Canada has agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Vietnam's Hue University.

Denmark has provided medical supplies and is willing to train Vietnamese nurses in Denmark. No troops,

France since 1956, says the State Department, contributed \$111 million in assistance to South Vietnam. That is since 1956. A big contribution. No troops.

Germany has provided 12 personnel in Vietnam and has agreed to provide 14 more for a total of 26. They, too, are providing a large amount of help. No troops.

Ireland has contributed 1,000 pounds to Vietnam through their Red Cross. No troops.

Italy, where we have dumped more billions of dollars—and I mean billions—have provided a nine-man surgical team and are providing science scholarships. No troops.

The Netherlands. The Dutch have given antibiotics. No troops.

Spain has provided 800 pounds of medicines and has agreed to send a military medical team to Vietnam. No troops.

Switzerland, the home of a lot of our gold and bank accounts. I wish there were some way we could find out how many of the black marketeers and corruptionists in Vietnam have unnumbered bank accounts in Switzerland as well as some other people. However, the Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. No troops.

Now we get down to Britain, which is threatening to invade little Rhodesia and bring that friendly country to its knees. In one of the most outrageous enterprises in the history of this country, President Johnson has joined the British in their boycott of Rhodesia. The British have provided six civilians for the British advisory mission in Vietnam and a professor of English at Hue University. With 8 Vietnamese already in training in England, Britain has agreed to provide

for 12 more this year.

That is the British Empire or what is left of it. They are perfectly willing, apparently, if all else fails and they are losing their boycott of Rhodesia—they are perfectly willing it seems to send two divisions there to beat that little country down and stir up more ferment and more trouble in Africa in the process. Apparently the explosion and massacres in Nigeria have not given the United States enough to handle for awhile, so this administration has to help stir up more trouble in Rhodesia.

Now getting to Latin America, the Argentines have sent two observers to Vietnam to examine the possibilities for Argentine assistance. They are going to send some observers down to find out whether there is any place for them to do any fighting or dying in Vietnam.

Brazil has provided coffee and medical

supplies. No troops.

In the Dominican Republic they are having their own troubles, but they have offered some cement.

offered some cement.

So it goes around the world where we have frittered away at least \$130 billion trying to buy friends and influence people. Yes, as Lodge reports, most of the rest of the world is deeply gratified that we are fighting and financing the war in Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. King].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, there are some who may be reluctant to approve further public funds for non-military purposes in South Vietnam until they are assured that private philanthropic agencies are also given a full opportunity to assist. Let me assure the members of this committee that private philanthropic groups are giving valuable assistance in South Vietnam. Their story is a noble one, that deserves to be told.

A recent on-the-spot survey by representatives of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service reported that "the refugee situation in Vietnam is in good hands." They found 43 voluntary agencies with either operational or supporting interest in Vietnam. Their varied programs are supplementing that of the Government of Vietnam and the Agency for International Development. These nongovernmental groups serve special needs and establish direct person-to-person relationships where Government programs cannot operate so easily. Twenty-eight private agencies were running refugee relief programs.

For example: CARE is distributing packages financed by donations of the American people, including school supplies, tools, and seeds; needle trade kits to accompany sewing machines, and rice, salt, and fish, purchased locally.

Catholic Relief Services is expanding its services by 2 percent for school lunch programs, family feeding stations, and relief of war victims. It will quadruple its shipments of medicines, expand its vocational schools and cooperatives, and increase orphanages and social welfare services.

Church World Service took part in the initial refugee program in 1954 when 800,000 Vietnamese fled south. It has returned to Vietnam to serve the new influx of refugees, providing nurses and medical units, community development and agricultural teams, and some supplies for direct relief.

Other church-related agencies providing similar services and supplies include the Christian Children's Fund, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Mennonite Central Committee. Other agencies with special competence are helping with the blind, lepers, orphans, foster parents, public health, and rural electrification.

The International Rescue Committee, in cooperation with AID, has accepted the responsibility for six medical teams to be assigned to refugee areas. Leading American drug companies already have donated a substantial supply of drugs for civilian use, and the Medical Civic Action Program will distribute them throughout Vietnam.

International Voluntary Services has been operating a program in Vietnam since 1957. Under an AID contract, IVS has 50 young men serving throughout the rural regions, working on projects in agriculture, science education, teaching English, and in work with youth and refugees.

The number of refugees will soon exceed a million, and will seriously tax the resources of all agencies. The most pressing need, according to the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, is for more personnel. Supplies there are, but people are needed to help in the camps where 450,000 refugees are now being cared for, and in the villages to which they return or are resettled. Doctors, nurses, administrators, social welfare, and community development experts are wanted on short- and long-term assignments both by voluntary agencies and by AID.

In spite of all the difficulties, the refugee problem in Vietnam is being handled with vigor, and great self-sacrifice. I, for one, want to see that every cent of the AID request is provided for this vital work.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment and commend the gentleman from Utah for pointing out to

the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and to the country, the splendid effort being made by the private, voluntary, and religious organizations in Vietnam and in the rest of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would add to the remarks of the gentleman, if I may, that our Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements has studied the scope of organizational contributions to human betterment, in the areas of economic well-being, education, health. and all others. Our study fully corroborates what the gentleman has reported about the voluntary agency and religious group effort to help in South Vietnam. The report shows that there are several thousand such organizations in the United States helping throughout the entire world, and it is estimated that such private assistance amounts to about \$600 million a year.

This represents a substantial and knowledgeable effort on the part of U.S. citizens to express their interest in the welfare and freedom of other people of the world.

This is a story which ought to be told more frequently. It is a story that all of the American people ought to understand and in which they ought to take great pride.

Mr. KING of Utah. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation because I believe it is necessary that the U.S. Congress provide all necessary funds for Vietnam and southeast Asia.

We people on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House have had adequate hearings and have discussed this legislation and the need for it. I would say to the House, I believe this is a good bill and should be passed so that there will be adequate supplemental foreign assistance authorization for the fiscal year 1966 under H.R. 12169.

I have several amendments I think should be placed in the legislation. The first one refers to the \$25 million for the Dominican Republic which is shown on page 3 of the section-by-section analysis of H.R. 12169.

I recommend that item should be specifically made by the United States not as a grant, but on a loan basis. The reason being this item is not just for current expenses but is to help on capital budget costs in the Dominican Republic. Capital expenditures should as a policy be advanced on a short- or long-term basis.

As a matter of fact, in the hearings we had the statement from Mr. Bell of AID as follows:

Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development, to technical assistance and to more permanent construction and long-range efforts to establish a stronger economy in the Dominican Republic.

When the purpose of the \$25 million is for longtime capital purpose, then I believe Congress should specify it should be on a loan.

But you say to me—Fulton, are we going to be depriving the Dominican Republic Government of needed assistance? The answer is "No."

If you will look at page 20 of the committee hearings, you will find that since the date of the revolution which occurred on April 24, 1965, through January 10, 1966, the great U.S. Government and the greater U.S. taxpayers have put in \$86.3 million as grants to the Dominican Republic. These were supporting assistance grants for Government operations and maintenance

In addition to that, there is \$50 million current 1966 authorized money in the President's contingency fund plus \$4.1 million carryover from 1965. I am not allowed to give you the details of it, but there is an allocation of \$37.3 million to the Dominican Republic out of \$54.1 million remaining in that contingency fund as of this time. That is not obligation—that is allocation. So that adding the \$86.3 million makes a total of \$123.6 million that the United States is providing now to the Dominican Republic.

The President now proposes to add \$25 million more as a grant. So this addition will mean since April 24, 1965, U.S. grants of \$148,622,000.

I believe that is one of the highest rates of grants we have ever had to a country of this size.

But you say to me—How about the present loans of the Dominican Republic? They have some loans under 1 year—\$30 million worth of loans due under 1 year. Those loans are owed to foreign banks. So we in Congress are just simply going to pick up the \$25 million of commercial foreign bank loans.

The Dominican Republic Government owes \$153.5 million on loans that are from 1 to 8 years maturity. The United States could make a 40-year loan to the Dominican Republic with 1-percent interest for 10 years, and 2½-percent interest for 30 years. This type of loan is authorized under present Federal acts. So that if the United States gives the Dominican Republic \$25 million as a loan on a long-term basis, they are not in such bad shape, as the United States has really given wonderful help to the Dominican people as follows:

U.S. assistance to the Dominican Republic, Apr. 24, 1965, to Jan. 10, 1966

Supporting assistance grants for Government operations and

maintenance_____ \$86, 300, 000

Administered through OAS... 57, 000, 000 Administered through AID... 29, 300, 000

Approximately \$40 million of these funds have been used to pay salaries of employees who were on Government payrolls, or were employed by municipalities or Government-owned corporations before April 24, 1965; \$12 million was made available to the Government-owned sugar corporation through a loan by the Organization of American States. The balance was provided for disaster relief including food and medical supplies and emergency public works activities which are being undertaken by the provisional Government and AID.

Technical assistance grants

totaled	\$4, 438, 000
AgricultureEducation	941, 000 396, 000
Transportation	212,000
Public administration	1, 161, 000
Community development	128, 000
Other projects	1,600,000
Development loans authorized:	
National Housing Bank	5, 000, 000
Food for peace	7, 858, 000
Title II emergency program Title III approved fiscal year	3, 007, 000

Another question you should ask me is who are the creditors of the Dominican Government and to whom are those loans owed? Obligations from 1- to 8-year maturity are owed to the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank, and the U.S. Treasury.

1966______ 4, 851, 000

On loans over 8 years, obligations of the Dominican Republic Government are owed to the International Bank, AID, Export-Import Bank, and to the U.S. Treasury under Public Law 480, title IV.

Why should the United States adopt a business basis and free enterprise policy toward the Dominican Republic at this time? The reason is that the Dominican Government is holding many businesses that are now Government owned and Government operated. These businesses are being operated at a deficit. The Dominican economic situation is this. First, there is a low rate of savings and investment. Nobody much in the Dominican Republic is saving or trying to help their government by avoiding inflation and seeking stable economic conditions.

Second, the Dominican exports are still being emphasized on commodities like sugar and cocoa which are in great oversupply at the present time and low priced on the international markets. The Dominicans have not changed their agricultural programs to realism and effective demand. This should be done at once both at home and abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Let us face it. Too large a share of the economy of the Dominican Republic is owned and operated by the Government at a loss. If we will simply insist in this Congress that the Dominican Republic change over and make immediate plans for changing to a private economy, the U.S. taxpayers will be much better off, rather than financing indefinitely the \$5 million a month Government deficit, and deficiencies in foreign trade because of inflation at home and continued deficits caused by excessive imports compared to exports.

My other point is this: I propose to offer an amendment to cut the President's contingency fund for from \$150 million, which it would be if Congress adds \$100 million more under this bill, to \$100 million total for the 3-month period to the end of the current fiscal year or June 30, 1964. As has been

pointed out, this contingency fund will be spent over a 3-month period—over April, May, and June of this year—so that if the President has \$50 million added on by this bill as I propose he will be getting undesignated contingency funds at the rate of \$200 million a year. This is in addition to the \$89 million special contingency fund for southeast Asia we in Congress have given the President for use in this current fiscal year, which is all the President asked.

In the current fiscal year we have in the contingency fund \$50 million currently authorized and appropriated, and allocated but not yet obligated. In this fiscal year 1966 we have also \$4.1 million of contingency funds carried over from 1965. That means a total of \$54.1 million presidential contingency funds on hand now, of which about \$37 million has been allocated to the Dominican Republic and the rest to other places, which I should not give specifically.

My amendment will give the President \$50 million more for the remaining 3 months of this fiscal year, until June 30, and I believe that is enough. If it is any larger, if the crisis anywhere abroad is any larger, I believe the President should come to Congress and get an authorization.

So I would say to this House of Representatives that we should hold the purse strings and watch expenditures closely. We should not move this contingency fund back up to the \$200 million contingency fund annually as it had been some time previously, several years ago, when the amount authorized and appropriated was not fully used.

The reason I say that is as follows: In fiscal year 1965, \$150 million was authorized for the President's contingency fund; \$99.2 million was appropriated and, as a matter of fact, the obligations were only \$57 million. In 1966 there was \$50 million authorized and appropriated. which appears to have carried the contingency fund for 9 months. So I believe \$100 million extra added on for a 3month period is at too great a rate for the President's contingency fund. I therefore recommend by my amendment that \$50 million now be added by the Congress to the President's contingency fund for the remaining 3 months after enactment until June 30, 1966. This will result by my amendment in a budget saving of \$50 million.

I do not favor Congress blindly authorizing and appropriating large sums of undesignated, unallocated, and unprogramed funds.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of this committee, with his typically accurate and effective argument, has stated the basic reasons for this legislation. Most of the money in this bill is for the economic support of South Vietnam. This little country is wartorn and threatened with runaway inflation. She has committed thousands and tens of thousands of her sons to battle, and all reports that have come to my attention have indicated that her men are fighting with ever-in-

creasing effectiveness, and that they are giving magnificent accounts of themselves in the field.

But this bill is also a part of a wider effort about which our President spoke in his great address in New York City last night. He said:

The strength of America can never be sapped by discussion—we are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness.

As this House acts on supplemental legislation for supporting our civilian and military men in Vietnam, I have no doubt that there will be vigorous debate. But let there be no mistake about our determination to resist Communist aggression in Vietnam. We have not sacrificed in Western Europe, in Berlin, in Greece and Turkey, in Korea, in the China Straits, in the missile crisis in Cuba, and now in Vietnam in vain. We are going to be true to our great principles of freedom, and to our commitments to help others preserve their independence.

I have heard it said that this is not a popular war, as if any war were popular. Some say the public does not understand why we are fighting—why we have such a vital interest in southeast Asia. And I say, as the President said last night—if you do not know, if you are not sure, ask the men who are there. They know.

Or ask the South Vietnamese, who have fought so valiantly to defend themselves. Ask the widows of the village chiefs who have been murdered by the Communists. Ask their sons and daughters. And they will tell you what Communist terror really means.

Or go through southeast Asia and ask leaders of Thailand, Malaya, the Philippines, Japan, why the war in Vietnam is important, and they will tell you.

Or, if you still do not believe, ask the Communists. They know what they are doing. They are not just fighting to win in Vietnam. They are fighting a so-called war of liberation which is a prelude to similar wars in every other underdeveloped country in the world. As the commanding general of North Vietnam said recently:

If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated everywhere in the world.

Let us be clear on this point—we are not fighting against a Democratic revolution within South Vietnam. We are not even fighting just the Vietcong. We are fighting Communist aggression. It is a different form of aggression than we faced in Berlin or Korea, or Cuba, but for that reason it is even more dangerous. Earlier forms of Communist aggression were easier to combat. People's emotions are more readily aroused in a war of invasion than they are in a war of infiltration. The Communists know that, and they are counting on us not to have the will to fight.

By passing this legislation by an overwhelming vote the House will demonstrate once again to the entire world, and especially to the Communists, the resolve of our country to stand firm against communism.

As the most powerful democratic nation on earth, we must bear the heavy responsibilities and burdens of leader-ship. The price of leadership is sacrifice-of men, of resources, of the normal pursuits of life. But these are small compared to the costs of failure. We have shouldered burdens before, and there is a long, hard road ahead.

But there is a human greatness in the democratic spirit, and in the soul of America, which will sustain us now as it has in the past. Without heroics, but with quiet courage and determination, Vietnamese and American men and women are proving once more the strength of free societies.

Sergeant Walling, U.S. Army, was such a man. You may remember what the

President said about him:

On the 19th day of June, this year, a young and brave American set out into the jungles of a distant land-half a world away. walked at the side of a patrol of young and brave Vietnamese.

Their purpose—and his—was to defend

freedom against its aggressors.

The name of that American was Harry A. Walling.

He was a sergeant of the U.S. Army-and a proud member of the proud Special Forces

who wear the green beret.

When the Vietnamese patrol came under attack, the only thought of Sergeant Walling was for the patrol-and its success. He gave no thought to safety or to self. Those who recovered his body found that, before he died. Sergeant Walling had fired his every round of ammunition.

We have come today to bestow upon Sergeant Walling one of our country's highest honors. No medal, no words, no eulogies of ours can honor him so highly as he has hon-

ored our country and our cause.

But we can-and we must always-honor ourselves by working everywhere we can, in every way we can, for a world of peace in which the young and the brave need not die in war.

When Sergeant Walling fell, he left behind his young widow and three young childrenthe oldest age 3, the youngest now 4 months. Mrs. Walling's bravery is no less than her

Two nights after she learned her husband would never return, Mrs. Walling wrote out a message to the other wives of her husband's unit. That remarkable letter has deeply touched all who have read it-including the Commander in Chief. I would like

to read these lines from it:
"I know you are all afraid for your husbands and love them as much as I loved my husband. He loved me just as your husbands do you, and he didn't want to die. He had so much to live for. But he was a brave man and a fighting man. My husband died for what he believed in, and if he had a choice of where and how he would die, he would choose the same place—fighting for a decent world for his children to grow up in.

"So don't let the world, the loneliness, the despair, and the fear get you down. Stand as tall as that man of yours who wears the beret and thank God you got him * * * my prayers are that all of your husbands come

home to you safe and well."

I am proud now on behalf of the Nation to bestow the Silver Star posthumously upon Sgt. Harry A. Walling.

Mr. Chairman, Sergeant Walling knew why he was in Vietnam. Now is the time for this House to show, once again, that it does too.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished majority leader vield?

Mr. ALBERT. I gladly yield to the distinguished minority leader of the

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished majority leader's yielding to me at this point. I subscribe almost entirely to what the gentleman from Oklahoma has just said. I want to emphasize that we on our side of the aisle strongly favor a position of strength against Communist aggression in South Vietnam, southeast Asia, Berlin, or anywhere else throughout the world. We have in the past and will in the future.

I am proud of the fact that the House of Representatives is taking up this important legislation today, acting upon it, I believe, constructively, acting upon it promptly, with a minimum of controversy and, I trust, with a minimum of

opposition.

It does deeply disturb me, however, that some Senators at the other end of the Capitol-I do not question their motives—are delaying the consideration of and the approval of legislation that is important to the execution of a policy of strength in southeast Asia. The enactment of this legislation will have an important impact, a favorable one, on the morale of our troops and our South Vietnam allies. Prompt action in the Congress will demonstrate to our enemies that the elected representatives of the American people can act affirmatively and constructively with the backing of a majority of the citizens in this great country.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman for what he has said. Certainly the House can demonstrate this afternoon, by the size of its vote and by the expeditious manner in which it acts, how it stands on this matter.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I vield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to direct constructive criticism toward this bill and the general problem which we face. I first wish to compliment the chairman of our committee for the very scholarly, the very distinguished, and the very statesmanlike manner in which he has conducted the operations on this side of the Congress. I would think the very least I could say about this bill as we process it this afternoon is that we are proceeding in a more practical way than our counterpart committee on the other side of the Congress and in a more practicable and reasonable fashion. I do commend the chairman. therefore, for his leadership and his soberness, even though I may not always agree with where he is leading us.

I should like to point out that there is really no argument for the passage of this bill. It is a \$415 million blank check for 4 months; that is, for the remaining 4 months of this fiscal year. If we had assurance that this money was intended entirely for South Vietnam in direct and practical support of our efforts there, I would have no criticism of it, but the fact of the matter is, as it was brought

out in the discussion earlier by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], that there is not a single dollar of this that must reach Vietnam. It could be diverted to any place in the world.

For the Congress to hand the AID agency or the State Department a blank check for \$415 million is, in my opinion, an abdication of legislative responsibility. If we were to pin this money down without any doubt and were in effect to say to the American public the situation in Vietnam is so complicated and so dangerous in all its ramifications that we absolutely need \$415 million for that world trouble spot, then I would not object. But that is not what we are saying here this afternoon. I suppose it would be asking too much for the Members to have their attention directed to the supplemental views. However, if you will note, this report was written because we wanted to provide some constructive suggestions and voice some practical ideas on how this bill should be analyzed by the Members. I should like to reemphasize a number of points. For example, the question of AID borrowing millions of dollars from other sources supposedly to assist programs in Vietnam; the completely loose bookkeeping procedures followed in the various agencies with which we are working. None of these charges in the supplemental views have been answered because they cannot be answered. At the same time I am sure the Members are not really asking for an answer. From what I have gathered, the determination of the President-and I am commending him in it—has been greatly fortified by the return of the Vice President from a recent trip to eight capitals where he was received enthusiastically and some degree of at least verbal, if not actual, support was given to our efforts. I would certainly hope that any vote here this afternoon would be interpreted as support of the basic position of our country as outlined by the President and not the unfortunate and headline-hunting type of procedure followed by the other body. But I do not think it is at all practical or wise for the House of Representatives to have its action interpreted as handing the AID agency \$415 million to spend as they please. In the atmosphere of the crisis in Vietnam, we are giving this agency, which probably has the poorest overall record for efficiency and effectiveness, this huge sum without any practical conditions attached. I do not believe any sober reflection could sustain this. I do hope when we finally get to the bill for fiscal 1967, there we emphasize the fact that we ought to keep stringent congressional control of these funds. Secondly, we ought to study these funds in the light of their practical use and not the blind support which is demanded by the executive branch.

We could do a far more reasonable task of supporting the President if we would ask more constructive and necessary questions, not in the spirit of unnecessary criticism but in the spirit of helpful criticism, which he sorely needs.

GALLAGHER. Mr. Mr Chairman.

will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, not to invoke an unharmonious note into this discussion, I do not want the Record to state, as indicated, that the majority view was less than sober, as the gentleman has said, and to reflect here and there upon the sobriety of the decision of the majority members of the committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct that impression. No agency in the history of our Government has been more closely scrutinized, down through the years, than has the AID agency. To say it has the poorest record in efficiency is not quite accurate. All of us look it over very carefully. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman], looks at it very thoroughly, this House reviews it very thoroughly. I believe the record of efficiency of the AID agency is really one of the high-water marks of governmental efficiency, especially under the able direction of Mr. David Bell.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I say when I used the term "sober," it is to compare our actions with those of the committee of the other body. That is the context in which it is used.

However, Mr. Chairman, when we think of this \$415 million blank check and the fact that it is being requested to support a war effort in South Vietnam, it raises many other additional questions, I relate an incident which supposedly occurred in a parliament of a so-called friendly country.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that during debate in this parliamentary body, one of the parliamentarians rose with a resolution asking or demanding that its government declare war on the United States. When the shocked members wanted to know why, he explained it thusly: That their government was bankrupt, their people were grumbling at the lack of progress and comfort, and he felt that by declaring war on the United States and immediately losing the war, the country would then qualify for massive rehabilitation at U.S. expense.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that this resolution was going to pass in this parliamentary body and that they would have declared war on the United States, so as to reap the benefits which they hoped would follow. At that point a very astute member of that body rose and raised one question. This question was: What will we do if we win the war?

Mr. Chairman, what will it take to put South Vietnam back into its normal, quiet, sleepy, traditional basis? I do not believe it is at all realistic for the United States to be pumping these millions of dollars into dubious domestic programs in South Vietnam, when their economy, their traditions, and everything else involved in the history of that country, will show that they are not equipped to absorb it.

To sum it up, logical support of the President is an act of statesmanship. This blank check is irresponsibility.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Grider].

COMMODITY IMPORTS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has before it an urgent supplemental request from the Agency for International Development for \$275 million in order to carry on its program of supporting assistance in Vietnam.

The bulk of this appropriation will be used to finance imports of essential commodities.

During 1966 it will be critically important to step up the export of American steel, oil, medicine, building supplies, and machinery to support the general economy and avoid disastrous inflation in South Vietnam.

Inflationary pressures will mount in 1966 unless Vietnam can import roughly double its 1965 imports and unless other stabilization measures are taken. If not checked, runaway inflation in Vietnam could cancel many of our most important gains

We must see to it that the shoe is not lost for want of a nail.

With a war-disrupted economy, South Vietnam has been unable to earn the foreign exchange needed to pay for these imports. Without them, the economy cannot function. Without enough of them, the already serious burden of inflation would become backbreaking.

Most of the commodity imports financed by AID move through regular commercial channels—meaning about 2,000 licensed importers in Vietnam. These merchants pay for aid-financed imports with their own currency, the piaster. The payment goes to the Vietnamese Government which uses the money to finance the war effort. AID requires that these imports be American made and that the American supplier be paid in dollars by AID when he ships his merchandise to Vietnam. Thus, AID is not providing dollars to Vietnam that can feed a black market in currency.

There is a black market in Vietnam, but it is not being fed by our aid. U.S. personnel in Vietnam, both civilian and military, are paid in script to avoid currency inflation. But in any country where foreign exchange is rationed for essential purposes, there are those who seek to obtain hard currencies for their personal use and are willing to pay high prices for dollars or pounds or francs. American officials and the South Vietnamese Government are attacking these problems at their source, and the improvement of the Vietnamese administrative ability and strengthening of controls will tend to dry up black market operations.

But the surest way to eliminate such operations is to bring supply more nearly in balance with demand—and this is what the commodity import program is designed to do. It may seem a small part, but let me assure you it is an extremely important part—of the total effort to help repel Communist aggression and to help the Government of Vietnam develop a society resistant to subversion and capable of independent progress.

AID's commodity import program for Vietnam may be as important to our ultimate success as any of our military weaponry. I fully support the supplemental request to carry this program forward.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. In light of the statement that the gentleman has made about the commodity import program strengthening the Cao Ky government, I wonder if the gentleman would comment on the testimony of Mr. Bell, the AID administrator, which is found on page 8 of the hearings where Mr. Bell stated:

But I would not argue in the slightest there is not some diversion both in the sense of people putting money outside the country in Hong Kong and Switzerland, and in the sense of significant amounts of resources being obtained by the Vietcong from Salgon and the import system.

I assume he was referring to the fact that we are not dealing here in the commodity import program with the South Vietnamese Government but rather with private importers who may in many cases misuse the privilege they have of exchanging piasters for military pay certificates at very profitable rates.

Mr. GRIDER. I will say to the gentleman, this of course is a possibility. I mentioned in my remarks that this condition was being improved. I would not suggest, and I do not think the gentleman would suggest that the whole important be turned over to the Government. We are trying to stimulate private enterprise in South Vietnam.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. The gentleman indicated in his statement that the recipient of this aid is the Government of South Vietnam. It is my understanding that the direct recipient, and properly so if we are going to recognize the value of the profit motive, is the private business sector in South Vietnam. That sector, of course, pays taxes on many of these commodities-rice is not one of them-but on many of these items included in the commodity import program. Is that not a correct statement of how the commodity import program works?

Mr. GRIDER. That is not to say that we should abandon the program because some of the people importing have been guilty of misfeasance; no.

Mr. MacGREGOR. And that the gentleman from Minnesota did not say or suggest.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12169, the supplemental foreign assistance authorization for fiscal year 1966.

Having just returned from an official but brief trip to South Vietnam for the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, I believe it is important to report briefly on a few of the matters before the House today.

It is correct that this overall authorization of \$415 million is essential to the success of our joint efforts in South Vietnam—for financing the import of essential commodities, for rural construction,

for port expansion, for refugee relief, and for general development.

The conflict in Vietnam cannot be won by military means alone because the military operations there are important largely as they allow the country to proceed with its social and economic reconstruction programs. Given the defeat of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese main force units, the civil actions programs in the villages and hamlets may have the security with which to proceed.

I would like to stress to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, the seriousness and the magnitude of the problem—and the major job that has to be done.

First, a word about the general logistic situation and the port of Saigon. We are some 3 to 4 months behind in catching up with our supply effort and our logistic needs. This has not been clearly stated, and I think it should be. The administration did not anticipate—even though this may have been difficult to foresee—the magnitude of the supply buildup. They did not get on top of it fast enough nor establish clear priorities.

Moreover, the Government in Saigon has been very slow to organize and direct the actual port operations. For many years there have been six or more different agencies involved—a system that is inefficient if not worse. At last I think we have had some serious discussions with the Government in Saigon on the need for single port management, and we are now starting to take corrective and vigorous measures to catch up. The new port at Cam Ranh Bay is encouraging, and new port and airfield facilities now under construction will markedly help. However, it is still a major problem.

Second, the question of inflation is real. During the past year the price of rice to the consumer in Saigon has gone up about 40 percent. Hopefully Prime Minister Ky, with a budget of 55 billion plasters, will try to keep expenses in line.

It is something of a commentary on the conflict in South Vietnam, and also an element in this import financing program, to note that a few years ago South Vietnam exported about 300,000 tons of rice. It was a significant part of the rice bowl in southeast Asia.

Today, because of Vietcong terrorism and the actions of main force units, Saigon has to import about 400,000 tons of rice. This is a measure of the problem.

The real job ahead, however, lies in the rural areas; in the villages and hamlets of South Vietnam representing about 80 percent of the people. We should recognize in this House that this is very nearly a lost revolution. For almost 20 years or more, very little has been done by the Government in Saigon to meet the revolution of rising expectations, to reach and work with the people in the villages, to offer them genuine participation in their Government and their future.

Hopefully, and at last, a program has been started that will give the people of South Vietnam some hope that the Government cares about their concerns, is going to work with them, and is going to meet the problem. During my recent trip I visited a village where the civil action program is in operation and a camp where political action workers are being trained. In the camp there are

3,000 students enrolled. The women are being trained in first aid, teaching, and health education; and the men are being taught construction and trade skills, the elements of rebuilding hamlet government, and necessary paramilitary skills.

Once trained, the students are divided into teams of approximately 40 members and sent back into the province from where they were recruited by the South Vietnamese province chief. They will work, live, and sleep in their villages. All too often in the past because of the Vietcong terror, village and hamlet chiefs left their village in time of peril to seek sanctuary in the district of provincial capital. Needless to say, this did not always enhance respect for them in their own villages. By the end of 1966 it is expected that civil action teams will be in 1,000 of the country's 12,000 villages and hamlets in four areas.

But I do not think we should kid ourselves about the nature, the character, or the extent of this commitment. We are dealing with a situation that is political and military—unless there is real security in the villages and hamlets, the pacification program will not really get off the ground. Over 20,000 village and hamlet chiefs have been assassinated in the last 3 years—one of the most recent was the tragic assassination of the popular mayor of Ap Quang Nam, a quiet, peaceful village which appeared to be on the road to pacification.

Equally the civil action program and rural reconstruction are long range and will take at least 5 years—possibly 10 or more.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I would state that unless the central government in Saigon initiates genuine and farreaching reforms in education, in land reform, in opening opportunities to the refugees, and in creating a sense and a conviction as to opportunity and participation for all people in South Vietnam, the work in the villages will not be supported and hope will be dashed.

We and our allies are committed in South Vietnam. We must fully back our men in the field—whose morale is magnificent—and we must do all we can to encourage South Vietnamese efforts at reform and reconstruction. Hence the need for this authorization which I support today.

And at all times we must utilize every resource of diplomacy—including the United Nations—to reach the conference table and an honorable peace.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if I have been surprised by anything in this discussion today, I must confess that what surprises me most is the unanimity of opinion that seems to be apparent. If I had a hat, I think I would take it off in salute to those gentlemen who have joined in a bipartisan foreign policy effort which is so vital to the security of the United States and to the free world. I would trust that we would have more of this kind of support of our effort on the part of both sides of the aisle.

I am a strong one for dissent, and I am a firm believer in discussion. I

think the discussion here today, however, has made it extremely clear-at least to me-that everyone recognizes full well the depth of the crisis. We might have doubts; we might have reservations; we might have wishes; we might have our "druthers"; but it looks like what we are going to do is to support this authorization as a matter of correct policy for the United States of America just as we supported the resolution giving the President the full authority in 1964 to use armed force in Vietnam. And we ought to support this authorization because it is the right thing to do.

I do not know what is going to happen in the other body or what kind of debate will take place in the other body from this time forward. But for me here to-day I am perfectly satisfied with the discussion and the debate which has transpired in behalf of the American people.

We have been holding hearings in the Foreign Affairs Committee almost daily since we reconvened this year. We have had full debate and discussion either in the full committee on the authorization or in one subcommittee or another on this entire subject of southeast Asia, including Vietnam. Everyone has had ample opportunity to get their viewpoint across, to be heard, to criticize, to delve, to contradict, to distract, or to do anything they want to do.

All members certainly have ample opportunity here on the floor, to say anything they wanted to about the policy of this country. But we are at the crux of United States-Vietnam policy today with the vote on this particular authorization. With the transpiring of the events since we last convened here in this body, we know a major change has taken place not only in Vietnam and around the world but also in the thinking of the American people. That is why this vote is important.

When we vote today we give a resounding vote of support to the President, and we are giving a resounding vote of support to the policy of this country.

I shall support this authorization and the necessary appropriation and the subsequent defense supplemental authorization and appropriation, because, as far as I am concerned, the military effort and the economic effort in Vietnam are inseparable in the policy of the United States in dealing with the problem of Vietnam, southeast Asia, the free world, and the security of the United States.

I am delighted at the courageous statement on the part of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adarr], who says he will support, if I understood him correctly, this authorization for those very same reasons.

We all have recognized the tremendous cost of doing a job that needs to be done and that has never been done before in the history of the world, in waging the kind of fight we are fighting in Vietnam and at the same time trying to help in maintaining a government and reconstruct the country while the warfare is going on. This only points out what we should have recognized and do now recognize, that we—the United States and the free world—must have a

nonmilitary answer to the subversive thrusts of communism anywhere in the world.

I disagree with those who say that we ought to always support the status quo, or that we should let people stew in their own juice, or that we should let the rest of the people of the world wallow in the depths of their own misery. This indicates to me a kind of blindspot, that we in the United States can live in someway apart from the rest of the world, and that we can bulldoze our allies into doing what we want to do when we want to do it, as if they have no sovereign rights, no right to independent thought, no right to independent action.

Certainly I get aggravated because other countries do not agree with me and my country at a time when I think they ought to. But is this not the very strength of our free and democratic system? The United States makes no claim of having a totalitarian hold on the rest of the free world. We act in concert but do so voluntarily. Is not this the kind of freedom we fight for? We are trying now to help the people of South Vietnam, who have fought for 100 years to throw off the yoke of oppression. Is this not what we are trying to do? Of course it is. We know it—the whole world knows it.

Most of the American people care, support this principle, and the price not only to assure the security of the United States, but also to assure that freedom as such—the concepts that we hold so dear and that we have fought for and that we are fighting for right now—have a chance to live. Because without that, then the money does not have any meaning.

So I want to join all of you today on the floor of this House who say: "We trust our President, our military and political leaders who support this request pending here." I believe that we have to do what is necessary, in what is a war zone, not only in the military sense but in the political sense.

Mr. Chairman, I have one concluding thought, I trust this authorization will be overwhelmingly approved. It should be

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, my participation in this debate, completely unexpected, was prompted by the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa IMr. Grossl, who made a disclosure on the floor of this House which, to say the least, surprised if not amazed me, when he recited the participation of other nations to the war in Vietnam.

Now let it be known, I have supported the administration completely in its views on Vietnam because I believe if Vietnam falls, so does all of Asia fall. I also believe that our Nation should keep its word. We were a signator to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. I quote from that treaty. Article IV reads:

Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any State or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger, etc.

This document is one of the legal and moral bases for our involvement. We are keeping our pledge. But what about the other signators to the treaty? What about the other nations in Asia who are so vitally affected?

I would like to propound three questions either to the Chairman or to any member of the Committee. In view of the reasons advanced as to why we are in Vietnam I would like to know, first, what are the Asian countries doing to protect Asia? It seems to me that if there were a flood in Pennsylvania and I were asked to come over and help the people of Pennsylvania to still the floodwaters, I would expect every Pennsylvanian to be there helping me. Our people want to know why Asia is not helping Asia.

The second question is this: What are the other signatories to this treaty doing to help implement the treaty and to carry out their word of honor that they would participate and oppose aggression?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Third, and I guess the most important question, because I think the first two questions are already answered by the disclosures of the gentleman from Iowa-the most important question is this, in my judgment, and I believe it is in the judgment of the American people: What is the administration doing to-and for want of a better word I say—to persuade the Asian countries and the signatories under this treaty to make a comparable-if not an equal at least a comparable-contribution to the one which we are making by giving each day that goes by our men in order to save southeast Asia for the Asian countries and for the world and to carry out our pledge?

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] for an answer to those questions.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that there is a considerable effort being made on the part of our allies to bring stability and peace to southeast Asia. While one of the gentlemen on the other side has derided the efforts of some of these nations, nevertheless Australia is making a substantial contribution. Australia has sustained casualties and men have been killed. South Korea is making a substantial contribution. They have 20,000 troops there and there is an additional troop contingent earmarked for Vietnam. The British, as signatories to the treaty, have 50,000 troops in Ma-laysia fighting the same kind of problem which we have. We have significant forces in Japan. The Philippines are our great friend and ally. They are sending troops.

I am sure history will record that Thailand is making one of the great and valiant contributions to the activities in Vietnam. New Zealand has troops there. India and Pakistan, of course, we recognize have problems of their own,

but by and large there is a great contribution being made by our allies there.

I think our Secretary of State and our Vice President, on the recent trip he made, have had some encouraging reports on the contribution which is going to be made on the part of our allies. I think we should start to focus on what is being done instead of what is not being done.

Mr. CAHILL. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to finish the last minute by making this observation. I have particular reference to the signatories to the treaty. The United King-dom, New Zealand, France, Australia, Pakistan, and, of course, what the gentleman from Iowa put into the RECORD which is represented by him at least to have come from the State Department delineating what their contributions are. My only point is this, Mr. GALLAGHER. I, of course, as I say, have supported the administration but I think there ought to be a greater effort made on the part of the administration to bring to the attention of these countries in southeast Asia the great danger which is facing them. They should be urged, if not persuaded, to make a contribution of military forces. I think the signatories to this treaty also ought to be urged to do likewise, because until they do that our people at home do not realize and do not appreciate that they are making what should be one of the real contributions to this overall effort.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, today, as we all know, some 200,000 American men are engaged in a war on the mainland of Asia, some 10,000 miles from our shores. Last night the President of the United States said he could not predict how long we would bear this burden. There is mounting evidence that the more men we involve in the jungles of Vietnam, the more men North Vietnam and the Vietcong are committing.

The escalation continues.

Mr. Chairman, it is reliably reported that the United States may have to double its manpower in Vietnam to 400,000 men, or even 600,000 men, in order to stabilize the situation and to bring under control any significant part of the territory of South Vietnam.

The callup of Reserves appears to be imminent.

Mr. Chairman, on past occasions on the floor of this House I have expressed my reservations and my misgivings about our policy in southeast Asia. I have proposed alternatives. On June 10, 1964, during debate on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964, I urged a negotiated settlement and spelled out specific proposals. I pointed out then that any solution must be accompanied by genuine economic and political reform. Now we are engaged in a land war in Asia, a war that prominent U.S. military experts have advised us against. Since May 5 of last year when I opposed the \$700 million supplemental appropriation for military activities in Vietnam, a war in which we were supposedly performing an advisory capacity under the military assistance program, has been converted to an American war which we are in fact waging on a much larger scale.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it has been a fundamental error to rely, as we have, upon a military solution and to have underestimated the economic aspects, the social aspects, and the political

aspects of this struggle.

We are today considering a bill which is concerned with the economic aspects, concerned with the social aspects, and concerned with the political aspects of this struggle. It provides \$175 million for the commercial import assistance program, which in effect is a program to support the war-torn economy. It provides \$100 million for what is called rural construction.

In the past our AID programs have not put sufficient emphasis on this rural construction effort. They have not given enough attention to the need to reach the people out in the countryside.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill. do so even though much of the money and effort will be drained off by the

growing conflict.

I hope we will be able to see some daylight in reaching into the hearts and the minds of the people in South Viet-

This is a struggle which, if it is going to be won, is going to have to be won politically; it is going to have to be won diplomatically, and in terms which the people themselves will be able to understand.

However, as long as the war escalates, our economic assistance program tends to become an extension of the military program since it is used to meet the effects of the war, not to develop a future peacetime economy.

U.S. military expenses in Vietnam are running at about \$10 billion a year, while economic aid for Vietnam is costing about half a billion dollars a year.

In yesterday's New York Times, Seymour Topping, respected southeast Asia correspondent, writes:

The South Vietnamese population is, according to all accounts, suffering more from military operations, terrorism, economic dislocation and corruption than at any other time during more than two decades of intermittent war.

He goes on to say that the social fabric of the country "seems to be unraveling."

We should recognize that the \$275 million increase in AID funds are unlikely to bring about significant changes in the dreary and frustrating picture described by the New York Times correspondent as long as the war continues to expand.

The American people should not be misled into thinking that our AID dollars will build a Great Society in South Vietnam. The fact is that, of necessity, more, and more AID money is going into the support of the war economy and not on economic development that will have long-range benefits for the Vietnamese people.

Eighty percent of the population lives in rural villages, but AID, because of the war, can take only token steps to improve the lot of the peasants.

In appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 26, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said:

The free Vietnam we seek to preserve through military efforts and sacrifices must not be undermined by economic and social chaos and despair. The expanding scale of Communist aggression and military response have added new dimensions to the task of

He added that he regarded economic assistance programs in Vietnam as of equal importance with military assistance efforts.

An increasingly larger share of AID funds will have to be directed to the task of keeping the Vietnam economy from collapsing under the inflationary pressures produced by the war. Rural construction programs in the villages and rural areas to develop school systems, water supplies, health stations, and agricultural know-how will be affected by the need to use funds to check the runaway inflation and by the realities of the military situation. Vietcong terror and destruction will prevent their implementation in 75 percent of the country.

David E. Bell, Administrator of AID, in appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, stated that our supporting assistance obligations had reached \$235 million by the end of 1965. This is almost the entire amount-\$255 million-appropriated for fiscal 1966.

To cope with rampant inflation, AID has expanded the financing of commercial imports. Of the additional \$275 million that is sought, a total of \$175 million will be allocated to this import program. And Mr. Bell states that he expects these inflationary pressures to be far more severe in 1966.

Assuming the supplemental funds authorized by the bill before us are appropriated, it is estimated that some \$370 million of the total \$530 million AID funds for Vietnam for fiscal year 1966 will be used for this import program. For fiscal 1967 this figure is expected to increase to \$420 million.

This program finances the import of both consumer goods and industrial materials to keep manufacturing and construction going, and to absorb the increased purchasing power. The disruption of the economy by the war necessitates this expanded assistance.

In addition to the \$175 million to finance an expanded import program, a total of \$100 million is asked for an expansion of counterinsurgency efforts or for "logistics, construction, welfare, and development projects." Here again, it is clear that these efforts for the most part are related to the military situation in the country and are war-support measures, involving construction projects to ease critical problems caused by damaged bridges, highways, clogged ports and warehouses. Also some \$20 million is needed to operate the growing refugee program, again a war-related project.

Only about \$50 million of the total \$530 million available is intended for the rural pacification or rural construction programs that attempt to satisfy

some of the basic needs of the 13 million Vietnamese peasants.

It has been reliably estimated that at least \$390 million of the total \$530 million will be spent on programs and projects that can be attributed to the deterioration of the Vietnam economy because of the war. Therefore, only some \$140 million is to be used for economic development programs, either of the rural variety or of the type involving the construction of highways or the training of teachers.

While I support this supplementary authorization, we should not be deluded into believing that these funds will somehow open up a new era in the economic development of Vietnam and that this will turn the military tide.

Can war be waged and meaningful, grassroot economic development of a peasant economy be carried out con-currently? More than \$2.7 billion has been poured into economic assistance programs in Vietnam in the last decade. Because it has mainly been used to support the savage war, there are precious few results to show for our munificence.

Let us not expect any dramatic results from the \$275 million that we are asked to approve for Vietnam today. Let us be frank with ourselves and with our

fellow Americans.

The war in Vietnam has claimed many victims, including Great Society programs at home. The long-range purpose of the AID program is one of the casualties. I fear that this will continue to be the case until there is peace in that war-torn country or at the very least until there is a cessation of hostilities.

The goals outlined by the President at the Honolulu conference are both admirable and praiseworthy. Plans were articulated for more intensive efforts to pacify the countryside by economic and political means so that a government apparatus can be set up that might be responsive to the needs of the vast majority of the population.

President Johnson has said:

The war we are helping them fight must be won on two fronts. One is military. The other front is the struggle against social injustice; against hunger, disease, and ignorance; against political apathy and indif-

Of course, we ought to direct our energies and efforts to the second front that the President talks about.

However, it is going to be almost impossible to succeed against political apathy and indifference while the Vietnamese peasant is trapped and buffeted by this war. One day the Vietcong attack his village and destroy his home: the next day American bombers wreak havoc in his hamlet, in quest of the Viet-

The limited rural pacification program that AID is undertaking may be about all that can be done in the incredibly difficult circumstances of a full-scale land war. If the Vietnamese peasant is to be persuaded, if imaginative programs concerned with the welfare of the Vietnamese people are to be set up in the provinces, then first a way to end the fighting will have to be found. Only

then can meaningful economic development of the country be carried out.

If the Saigon Government hopes to be successful when free elections are finally held, it must forge firm political, economic, and social links with the people.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is now encouraging the central government to adopt a program which will build hospitals, and health stations and schools, and help with the development of the agricultural economy. This, the President talked about at Honolulu as the second front in this war. But let us face the fact that we are really not going to be able to succeed with this second front so long as it is operated concurrently with an enlarged and escalated military effort.

The second front to gain the support of the people, the war to conquer disease and hunger in South Vietnam, is hamstrung by this total involvement in military operations. As long as the South Vietnamese peasant is caught between the Vietcong on the one hand and the U.S. military forces on the other, he simply is not going to have an opportunity to develop the relationship which is needed with his own government.

So, Mr. Chairman, while it is necessary to expand and extend our economic assistance, nevertheless, we should not believe that this will open up any Great Society for the people of South Vietnam. This is doing nothing more than enabling them to keep their heads above water economically. It should be recognized and supported for what it is.

It is imperative that we spare no effort and leave no stone unturned to reach a peaceful solution of this tragic conflict.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.
Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for yielding me the additional time.

In summary, I believe the objectives of this proposal, particularly of the rural construction program, are meaningful objectives, and I hope that from this point on a great deal more effort will be put into political and social programs which should, if properly carried out, reach the people. This is a struggle for the hearts and minds of men. In the long run it will be won by the power of our ideals.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the discussion today has indicated quite clearly why we can be confident that there will be virtual unanimity in favor of this bill. I surely hope that will be the case because in my opinion, this is a most important bill. It is important also that we move with reasonable speed.

There has been some indication during the debate today about whether or not we are wise in mounting the military effort that we have been making in Vietnam. However, there can be little debate on the advisability of the funds which are being sought in this bill. These funds are not being requested to

prosecute a war, although they are, as President Johnson indicated, of equal basic importance to our military effort there. Unquestionably, the aid which will be provided in this bill will be used to help provide a strong front against aggression. As Vice President Humphrey said at a briefing at the White House today, we are concerned both with a war against aggression and a war on misery.

Quite briefly, these funds are to help us in the latter struggle.

I should like very briefly to report what the Secretary of State said before the Committee on Foreign Affairs when he justified the funds. I quote:

The free Vietnam we seek to preserve through military efforts and sacrifices must not be undermined by economic and social chaos and despair. The expanding scale of Communist aggression and our military response have added new dimensions to the task of AID. Without our AID programs we could win the major military battles in Vietnam and still lose the war and the peace.

For this reason I regard our economic assistance programs in Vietnam as equal in importance, although not nearly so large in scale, with our military assistance.

I should also like to give the two major reasons why the Secretary of State appealed for these funds.

He says the first reason is to meet, and I quote:

First, to meet the rising and severe threat of inflationary pressures, additional funds are needed to finance imported goods; \$175 million are now needed to finance importation for commercial sale of goods such as rice, construction materials, petroleum products, fertilizer, drugs, and many other commodities. In this way we contribute to economic and political stability, by offsetting shortages in local production and maintaining morale essential to the entire effort.

Second, \$100 million is needed to fund new or expanded activities to strengthen the Government of Vietnam's work in contested rural areas. These AID operations include refugee relief—

And we have heard of the many hundreds of thousands of refugees who are presently in South Vietnam—

provision of medical teams and individual doctors and nurses; building or repairing of hospitals and veterans' rehabilitation centers; leasing of ships for coastal and ocean supply operations; expanding civil airlift capacity; building of warehouses, bridges, roads; repair of war-damaged rail and other facilities; installation of temporary and permanent electric power services; construction of workers' housing and training centers; police equipment and training—

Quite obviously, the list is long. The needs of South Vietnam are tremendous. It is quite evident that if we do authorize the money, it will be spent in that country and, of course, in the countries around Vietnam in the amounts which have been requested.

I myself believe that an argument can be made to support earmarking funds in a foreign aid bill. In this case, however, it is unrealistic for us to argue that there is any need to earmark these particular funds. It is quite obvious that the basic necessity is there. The necessity is obvious from the fact that we have already borrowed almost \$64 million from other funds within the foreign aid program. From the amount being requested, that sum must be reimbursed. So the basic issue should be, not how much might be diverted to areas not of primary concern such as Vietnam, but how much more will be needed in that country.

Whether or not language is put in the bill to require earmarking, it is quite clear the administration will do as it has indicated. We have every reason to trust them.

One final point, Mr. Chairman. There has been some indication of dissatisfaction with the contributions of our allies to the effort we are making in Vietnam. Of course, our effort is tremendous. Of course, every effort should be made to have that burden shared with our friends and allies and others who have an interest in southeast Asia. Yet we do ourselves no good and we surely are not recognizing the contributions that our allies have made, or that they might make, by in effect belittling and sneering at what they have done.

In many cases these countries are poor and primarily concerned with their own problems. In many cases there has been a substantial contribution already made, and more are evidently in the works. Without any question the neighbors of Vietnam realize the importance of what is going on there. There is an increasing awareness of the practical problem that we have faced up to so deliberately.

Quite practically, one of the reasons why some of our small allies or our less wealthy allies have not done more may be because they are somewhat intimidated by the nature and the size of the effort of the United States. When we can afford to pour the billions of dollars that we do into this effort of ours—and it is primarily our effort—it does make any minor contribution from a small country seem like very little. Yet the sacrifices involved in order to make those small contributions should, I believe, not only be recognized but should be received with thankfulness.

In conclusion I should simply like to reiterate that the funds we are requesting here today are a relatively small part of the fight and the effort which we are making in southeast Asia. But these funds are of equal importance and significance to our military efforts in the success of our efforts. I hope we are virtually unanimous in supporting the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but I had the good fortune of going on a study mission to the Orient during the last congressional recess.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12169. I do so because I have seen what our dedicated AID people have done and are continuing to do in our friendly Asian countries. They have performed and are continuing to perform near miracles in helping our Asian friends to help themselves.

In Taiwan, for example, our AID people have helped to create such a viable agricultural economy that the farmer and the farmworker enjoy a higher income than the factory worker.

In Korea, our AID program under Public Law 480 has been so successful that we have virtually wiped out hunger and so-called spring scarcity in Suwon Valley and other once poverty stricken areas. I was never so proud of being an American as I was last November, as I stood atop a knoll overlooking the rice fields of Suwon Valley, and the Governor of Kyonggi Province pinned a medal on my chest as he conferred an honorary citizenship on me. I knew then that I was being so honored, not because I looked like one of them, or because I spoke their language, but because I was an American and represented that country which had helped them to live the better life that they are now enjoying.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Korea are truly grateful for what we have done to help them through our AID programs.

And so are the people of Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, and South Vietnam. But there is much more that needs to be done and must be done, if we are to win the peace, especially in South Vietnam.

In South Vietnam the farmer cultivates a land capable of great productivity. Despite a primitive system of agriculture, inadequate tools, and lack of technical knowledge, South Vietnam used to be the rice bowl of southeast Asia. The Vietcong with their acts of terrorism have changed it from a land of abundance to a land of hunger.

Plagued by mass murders, fire, and destruction, South Vietnam has become an importer instead of an exporter of rice.

With the assistance of American AID programs the people of South Vietnam are striving to make the land productive once more in the midst of war. AID seeks to give the Vietnamese farmer a stake in his country and a chance to live in peace and security. More than 1,000 agricultural extension agents have been trained with U.S. help since 1955. More than 800 of these are working in the rural areas of the country. Three new vocational agriculture schools have more than 1,500 students enrolled. And an increasing number of skilled specialists have been graduated from agricultural colleges since 1962. Experimental stations in agriculture have been established with U.S. help in a nationwide network.

A national seed board has been organized to plan and expedite the multiplication of superior seed varieties, tested and produced by the experimental stations. Improved rice seed has been distributed to more than 50,000 families. Where fertilizer has been distributed, crop yields have increased by as much as 40 percent; and these programs are continuing. Pesticides, too, are helping the farmer increase his yields—he can take advantage of these benefits through liberal credit programs—and he does.

eral credit programs—and he does.

He has been able to get breeder pigs, corn to fatten them, and concrete to build sties. An AID-sponsored veterinary program has eliminated hog cholera—a serious killer disease, and the farmer now has new income from the sale of his pigs, and he can continue moving toward a better life.

Until peace comes to the land, however, its fullest productivity cannot be realized. And so, we give to our allies in South Vietnam the benefits of crops grown in our own land. Through the food-for-peace program, in what must be the most graphic illustration of what the program can mean, we are making a number of our products—such as sweetened condensed milk, wheat flour, rice, and vegetable oil—available to supplement the produce of South Vietnam.

Progress has been made in the fishing industry, too. At least 14 major fish markets and wharves have been built and put into operation. More than 10,000 boats have been equipped with motors, and all time highs are being reached in the catches. Thus fishing is becoming a major source of income and the increase means that food is available at lower cost to the Vietnamese consumer.

Mr. Chairman, through AID programs we have been able to show the South Vietnamese that he now has a stake in the outcome of the war. By helping himself and learning new and better methods, the Vietnamese farmer realizes now that he is building for a better future for himself and his loved ones.

If we are to win the war in Vietnam we must continue to expand our efforts to improve Vietnamese agriculture and provide a solid basis of security for the Vietnamese people. If we are to win the peace we must increase our efforts to export our know-how and show-how to those in need. This our dedicated AID people have done most commendably, and through the support of Congress must continue to do.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] for his excellent statement. It is a pleasure to report to the House on the great service that he rendered our country on his tour of the Far East during the congressional recess. He was certainly a oneman ambassador of good will for the United States and the American people in all the friendly Asian countries we on the committee visited.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I have been deeply interested through all of this debate, interested particularly in the unanimity that seems to pervade this Chamber. We do not agree on all of this bill, and a good many of us would like to see the contingency fund changed. We will see what happens when the amendments are suggested.

The war there is something that we are quite unable to understand unless we have been fortunate enough to have gone over there, as I was fortunate enough to go to Europe during the war, and to have seen the way things really happen.

You have seen what it does to our men. I hope you saw what I have had told to me so many times—the tremendous courage of our soldiers and their certainty that they are fighting the fight for

realized. And so, we give to our allies in right, for freedom, for everything that South Vietnam the benefits of crops grown in our own land. Through the

I hope this bill will make possible in our explanation of it to our people at home, and of the use that is made of the money—that we will be able to demonstrate more and more each day that we are there because we were invited; that we are still there because we cannot betray those people over there and leave them to the Communists.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Chairman, that this bill may be passed practically, if not entirely, unanimously.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to share in this rising tide of unanimity and to announce my support of this legislation that we are considering here today.

I, too, want to compliment those Members on the other side of the aisle who have recognized that support of our country and support of the President in these difficult days does require that we join together at times like this with the objective of backing up our men in uniform and our civilian administrators who are in the field in southeast Asia and at the same time helping to strengthen the social fabric of our friends in South Vietnam.

It is particularly important in considering this legislation to see just what it does in its significant sections.

Mention has already been made of the \$175 million that would go for the financing of additional imports, but it is in the \$100 million section, I think, that most of the impact resides. This section affects people. It involves refugee relief. It involves activities to improve conditions in rural areas. It involves the provision of doctors and nurses and medical teams. It involves the construction or the repair of bridges, roads. and rail facilities. It involves the construction of hospitals and workers' housing. Finally, it involves training of police and security forces who will help to bring to the countryside and to the people protection from the depredations of the Vietcong which have terrorized them for so long.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] said that we are not going to build a great society with this program. is true, but I am sure that no one connected with this bill at any stage had any idea that we would do such a thing. First of all this is an emergency program and is limited in scope. Second, the element that has been preventing us from moving into the field of assistance where we could consider cooperation on a peacetime program has not been any activity of ours but the aggression of North Vietnam and the terroristic activities of the Vietcong. Certainly we could cooperate in a peacetime constructive program if these destructive activities were curtailed or eliminated.

This then is foreign aid, but it is foreign aid that is specialized and limited. I certainly have no doubt, even though doubt has been expressed here today by some people, as to what will be the destination of the funds that are authorized in this legislation. There is no question in my mind that not only these funds but several times the amount of the funds provided in this authorization could be and will be probably used in a relatively brief time in South Vietnam.

Of course, we are dealing through this bill and through the defense appropriation bill which will come to us very shortly with the aggressive Communist imperialism. Certainly we want to do everything we can to repel this imperialism.

Incidentally, in considering the activities and contributions of some of our allies and associates I should like to add to what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen], said about some of them; namely that there are two other countries who have very substantial problems of their own and are still dealing with them. One of these is Malaysia where the British have contributed 50,000 troops, and the other is Indonesia which is going through revolutionary throes now because of the Communist aggression in that country.

So I think this legislation does say that this program is important. It does say that it is needed now. It does say that it is so important that it cannot wait for regular legislation to be taken up in the normal process of things. It is serving a vital program of our Nation. It is backing up the 500,000 men of the Republic of South Vietnam who are in the field and are saying by their presence there that they are worthy of our support. I am sure that the House will do no less than give its overwhelming and I hope unanimous backing to this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman I, too. want to say that I am pleased at the unanimity that is shown here this afternoon on this particular piece of legislation. There may be disagreements on some elements of it. I think the House is aware of the fact that I have been as much of a critic and watchdog of the AID administration as most anybody in the House. I asked the Secretary of State when he was testifying before our committee on this bill about the black marketing in Saigon. I pointed out that when the staff director of our committee and I were there we had been apprised of one person who sent a substantial sum of money back to the United States. The Secretary assured us that day he would have the matter looked into very closely. I have learned only today that one civilian employee of a contractor out there has been ordered out of the country and has had his passport invalidated because he sent back \$30,000 to the United States and could not explain how he got it.

This sort of thing is, unfortunately, almost inevitable in a situation like this. but I am delighted to be able to say that the people responsible for the AID program and for our conduct out there are alert and that when these matters are brought to their attention they do something about them. I believe that is a helpful thing, as far as I am personally concerned, and should be as far as the House of Representatives is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter that I would like to mention. I would like to sort of apologize to the House of Representatives. There have been a lot of remarks made on the other side of this building which I believe have aided our enemies out there, because I believe they are hoping for us to get tired of this war and quit. I further believe that is the reason they think they are win-

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the junior Senator from my State made a personal attack upon the Secretary of State and said that he ought to resign. On behalf of the people of my district I want to apologize, because I supported the junior Senator a year ago last fall. ran 1,025,000 votes behind the President in Ohio, the junior Senator's majority in the entire State of Ohio was 16,000 votes. He received a larger majority than that in my district.

So, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my constituents I want to apologize for his intemperate attack upon the Secretary of State, whom I think is doing a great job under very difficult circumstances.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will

the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I am delighted to yield to my fine colleague from Ohio, the Congressman at Large, and who represents all of the State of Ohio.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] for the courageous position he has taken here today in offering an apology to the House of Representatives and to the Nation for the quite intemperate remarks of the junior Senator from the State of Ohio made in the other body here yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of the State of Ohio, I would like to join with the gentleman from Ohio. I feel we can be doves and hawks and of various opinions without resorting to such disagreeable tones.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from the State of Florida [Mr. FASCELL] said earlier this afternoon, these are times when great unanimity must be displayed by those of us on the side of freedom.

I feel that the intemperate personal attack upon the most distinguished foreign minister this Republic has had in many years is certainly out of order. and I certainly offer an extreme apology on the part of the people of the Buckeye

Mr. HAYS. I thank the distinguished and hard-working gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I support this legislation, and I support the President's position. As I told a member of the administration today, the gentlemen on the other side of the Capitol who are attacking us, who are attacking our being in South Vietnam, have nothing to lose politically, because if we win this thing they have 4 or 5 years to go before they are up for election, and everyone will forget their position.

Mr. Chairman, if. God forbid, we should lose it, they can say "I told you so."

So, Mr. Chairman, they have nothing to lose politically; they cannot lose.

In conclusion, I would like to allude to one remark that our junior Senator made. He said he would sleep better at night if somebody else were Secretary of State. Well, if he sleeps at the switch much more than he does now, he will be asleep 24 hours a day.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement on H.R. 12169, a bill to authorize the appropriation of supplemental funds for fiscal year 1966 AID economic assistance programs totaling \$415 million

A significant portion of this supplemental request, \$275 million, is designed for use in South Vietnam. I traveled to Vietnam after the 1st session of the 89th Congress adjourned last year because I wanted to see for myself the existing conditions in this distant land where our servicemen are fighting to preserve and protect the freedom of the

people of South Vietnam.

It is apparent that the mood of good will which prevailed when American troops first landed is showing definite signs of deterioration. There is a possibility that our relationship with the South Vietnamese people could further deteriorate as the full impact of American spending hits the economy and more of the technically skilled South Vietnamese move to cities adjacent to U.S. military installations where huge construction projects are being pushed to provide logistical support for our combat troops. One Cabinet Minister in the South Vietnam Government told me with a trace of irony in his voice, "An American staff sergeant earns more per month than I do.'

In my opinion, the only way the war in South Vietnam can be won is to win the battle for the hearts and the minds

of the people.

The past year has demonstrated that a clear and unequivocal military policy by the United States could produce a rapport with the South Vietnamese Government for the benefit of the country. If our policy is just as clear with respect to the South Vietnamese Government instituting social, political, and economic reforms, can we not expect a greater response in this direction than ever has occurred in the past? I think that the United States must not only implore, but demand, that the Ky government overhaul its policies and the apparatus of its administration to guarantee a maximum of public acceptance and identification with the national government in Saigon. We must insist on general elections at the earliest possible time. We should not be satisfied with lip service being given to reform. should insist that positive steps be taken.

It is not an easy task to remake a poor nation into a developed nation. Nor is it easy for the government of a poor nation to gain the confidence of its people. I was told by U.S. officials in Vietnam that 70 percent of the people are illiterate. A majority of South Vietnam's 151/2 million population is tied to the land

in little better than subsistence agriculture. Only 18 percent of the children who complete primary school go on to secondary school and a significant proportion of the children never go to school at all. There are over 1 million refugees from the combat zones banded together in numerous camps awaiting relocation the cessation of hostilities to return to their own farms and villages. There are few schools available for children of refugees and sanitation conditions in the camps are primitive at best. Disease is widespread throughout the country. One Navy corpsman told me that if there were enough soap available for the people in the villages and if they would use it. disease could be cut down 50 percent.

The people do not have a sense of national identity the way Americans do. The nation-state is for us the focal point of political loyalty, economic strength, social order, and defense against foreign enemies. The Vietnamese have social and cultural homogeneity; but never having known true statehood, and after being a colony of France from 1885 to 1954, they have but limited loyalty to the National Government. An overwhelming majority of village dwellers in the countryside have never seen a high National Government official, let alone never having voted for one. Too often the only contact the people have with the Federal Government is the payment of taxes, with no services or security being provided in return. Living as many of them do in wretched physical circumstances, they are relatively easy targets for Communist propaganda and prom-There is no way of avoiding the fact that 22 percent of the population and over 50 percent of the land in South Vietnam would not be under the control of the Vietcong if the people themselves were not actively or tacitly accepting the Communist presence. The problem is intensified because of poor communications between villages. Roads are few in number and travel is made hazardous as a result of repeated Vietcong ambushes along the highways. Telephones and telegraph are nonexistent in many parts of the countryside. The fact that the people have no national identity does not mean this must always be so.

The United States has entered into a substantial economic aid program for Vietnam. In fiscal year 1965, we contributed \$283.2 million. We have already obligated all of the \$255.5 million appropriated for fiscal year 1966 and we are asking for supplemental funds in the amount of \$275 million. The object of our program is to develop the resources of the country and to give the rural and urban population a feeling that there is a better life obtainable in the future and that their own government is better able to provide it than the Communists. Among other things, the United States is supplying agriculture extension services, fertilizers, pesticides, and medical care; building roads, schools, and hospitals, and helping develop local government administration in rural areas.

In my opinion, we are not doing enough for the approximately 800,000 refugees that are currently in the South Vietnam Government controlled areas. I visited a number of camps where the conditions were very poor. Sanitation facilities are often nonexistent and educational opportunities for the children are totally unsatisfactory. A small vocational training course has been initiated to provide technical training for less than 1,500 persons. This is insufficient to have any real impact upon the refugee population. There is no question that South Vietnam is going to need an increasingly large number of trained technicians to support industrial growth. An effort should be made to train these refugees who sit in their camps all day without work. By doing so, many of these homeless people could be kept temporarily occupied and made productive members of the society, rather than charity cases draining off an inordinant amount of the nation's limited capital resources to keep them alive. It is commonly pointed out by AID officials that most of the refugees are women and children who are waiting to return to their villages and to their agricultural way of life. This does not mean, however, that many of these refugees would not prefer an education and vocational training so that they could take up a new life in the urban areas.

It has also been suggested by AID officials that if life is made too pleasant in the refugee camps that the refugees will not want to go back to their farms and work for a living. No one is suggesting that the refugees be made permanent welfare cases. What I am saying is that the refugee children should be able to receive as good an education as other children in the country. To date the children of the refugees are offered a substantially inferior education, with many refugee camps not providing any schools at all. Only an infinitesimal percentage go to secondary school upon the completion of primary school. This situation must be corrected.

I am disappointed that of the \$275 million requested for supplemental economic assistance to South Vietnam in a current fiscal year, only \$11.6 million is allocated to refugee programs. What is more, \$10 million of the \$11.6 million is already obligated to pay past debts. This leaves only \$1½ million in fiscal year 1966 to finance programs designed to aid approximately 800,000 refugees. This is dangerously insufficient to ease their condition and to promote their allegiance to the Government of South Vietnam.

It is significant that the refugees are made homeless by terrorist activities of the Vietcong, American, and South Vietnamese bombardment and combat in and around their villages. The refugees have made a positive commitment to come over to the side of the South Vietnamese Government. They did not go to the Vietcong secured areas. We must not allow this large population of tired, frightened, and homeless people to become so frustrated in their refugee camps by lack of concern for their well-being and inability to carry on productive lives that they become a force for sedition rather than a force in support of the South Vietnamese Government. There can be no excuse for failure to take positive action regarding the present condition and future destiny of the 800,000 refugees in South Vietnam today.

I am voting in favor of this supplemental appropriation bill because I feel that it is needed. It is essential that an economic and social revolution accompany our military efforts in Vietnam. Our economic assistance is the critical prerequisite to such a revolution taking place. Although we know there is a corruption in South Vietnam and although we know that much of our AID funds are siphoned off to the personal advantage of numerous corrupt officials, still the program is necessary. We must work to tighten up the administration of the program, but we must not sacrifice the program itself because of certain failures in that administration. I would like to say in conclusion that I think that David Bell, the Director of AID, has done a magnificent job in bringing new imagination, talent, and leadership to our economic assistance program. I am confident that he has the ability, if any man has it, to insure the success of the AID program in South Vietnam.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join with my colleague in urging favorable consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill before us. I should like to speak particularly on behalf of the \$25 million amount contained in that bill for assistance to the

Dominican Republic.

It is worth noting, that the provisional government of Hector Godoy operates under the most severe handicaps. Thirty years of dictatorship followed by political instability and the destruction and hatred of civil war have left the Dominican Republic ill prepared to create a democratic society.

Yet, that is what the Organization of American States, the United States and Dominicans of good faith are committed to today. Elements of both left and right would exploit the heritage of tyranny and the present unrest to gain control for themselves, but the provisional government is determined to steer a course toward democracy, and it is in this, that additional assistance is needed from the United States.

Support of the provisional government and of the Organization of American States by the United States has helped to prevent anarchy in the country. Gradually, that assistance is being shifted from emergency stopgap aid to development assistance that will build a foundation upon which the people of the Dominican Republic can create a democratic society.

The provisional government has had the support of OAS troops from the United States and Latin American countries. Technical and economic assistance has been given to prevent economic deterioration and to give the Dominicans themselves time to raise from the ashes a new society.

The cost has been great. Yet, if dollars, and technical assistance, and an understanding heart can be substituted for bloodshed and destruction, we must be prepared to pay the price. A hemisphere at peace, where men may lead good lives and may know social justice is our goal. It was the goal of the na-

tions that met at Punta del Este in 1961. It is the goal of the Alliance for Progress. It must remain our goal until every vestige of hopelessness and violence born of desperation is banished from our hemisphere

We are asked now to do that which is deemed necessary to give the Dominicans time to conduct an orderly election in June and to install a democratic government. For now, I am convinced that the immediate task of supporting the provisional government warrants our making available the supplementary amount requested by the President

I urge my colleagues to approve the supplemental appropriation that is be-

fore us

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I support the administration's request for a \$25 million supplemental appropriation for the Dominican Republic.

The Dominican economy has been beset with a number of enormous problems in recent years. Following the fall of Trujillo, the Dominican people demanded a better way of life and something more than a subsistence wage. High wage levels, however, created increased demands for imports, the meeting of which created balance-of-payments difficulties. Spending for consumption of imported goods left little for capital investments, public or private.

In 1964, this situation was further complicated by a spectacular drop in sugar prices, in which the economic health of the country rests.

The civil war has severely dislocated economic activity in the country. Total production of goods and services has declined and unemployment has increased. Commercial activity in Santo Domingo still suffers from the turmoil of last April. Strikes and other disturbances continue to plague the country.

The U.S. objective in assisting the Dominican Republic is twofold. On the one hand we are providing aid to relieve immediate suffering, to build stable conditions conducive to the holding of free elections, and get a society moving again. One example is assistance to repair of irrigation ditches which both liberates a material resource and provides the opportunity to put human resources to work again. To this effort other nations of the hemisphere have contributed medical personnel and emergency food supplies.

At the same time, we are looking beyond immediate measures in an effort to help the Dominicans start the task of building for the long-term growth of their country. The United States is providing technical cooperation to advise the Dominican Government in long-range problems of administrative, fiscal, and monetary reform. We are assisting the stimulation and expansion of food crops and the diversification of agriculture. We are helping community development projects including rural access roads, reforestration, and community centers, in all of which the great part of the job is borne by the local populace. Teacher training and vocational education are also being assisted in other efforts to reach the people directly.

While today, the most immediate need is for short-term assistance, assistance which has to date directly affected more than 200,000 people, this effort is a step only in a long-term drive to help a nation help itself. I urge support of this appropriation as a measure vital not in putting out a fire but as a link in a program to build an environment in which fires will become less likely.

The threat of Communist subversion is still very real in the Dominican Republic. Cuba stands in the Caribbean as a constant reminder of Communist ability to seize power by force and fraud.

Economic stability in the Dominican Republic and throughout Latin America is the best possible insurance against communism and that is the purpose of this appropriation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, for the past several years I have voted against foreign aid legislation. My reason has had a single purpose; namely, to register a protest against a program which in sum has been too often poorly conceived and poorly administered. By this I do not mean to say that there has

been no good in our foreign aid programs. But I determined some time ago that the only way to encourage the necessary reforms was to put the executive branch on notice that there were those in Congress who are dissatisfied enough with its overall operation to give it a vote of

no confidence.

The bill before the House today is a supplemental request to the bill which I voted against last session. Its basic purpose is to support our efforts in southeast Asia and especially in South Vietnam. While I am certain there are many aspects of this program that could and should be improved, I do not believe that this crucial hour with so many boys in daily combat is the time to register a protest which might in any way be construed to indicate a lack of support on my part for our overall effort in South Vietnam.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, because the attention of the American people is generally focused on reports from the war front in Vietnam, little is known of our fight to provide a permanent line of defense in the struggle for

men's minds in Vietnam.

With cement, roofing materials, and technical assistance supplied by AID, the people of Vietnam are building thousands of classrooms throughout the countryside. Of 9,000 classrooms constructed in the last 5 years, 1,600 were put together by the villagers themselves—a fact which has not been lost on the Vietcong. Knowing the value that the Vietnamese people place on the education of their children, the Communist guerrillas hesitate to destroy these new schools.

The steady accumulation of teaching facilities—made possible by the assistance of U.S. aid—now embraces half of all the primary school age children of the country. And AID is introducing practical subjects into the public school system to help the people solve their immediate problems; to grow better crops, improve their health, and raise standards of nutrition.

More than 14 million textbooks have been distributed by AID, and in the nation's four normal schools and 21 industrial schools, AID is helping to train teachers in new techniques of practical instruction. The normal schools are now graduating more than 2,000 teachers a year

In addition to equipping and improving these permanent training institutions, AID is helping to set up rural training programs to meet the demand for teachers in the villages. Local citizens are being prepared to take over classrooms after 3 months of intensive instruction. In one region of the country, the emergency sessions have provided nearly 600 new teachers. By way of incentive, the Vietnamese Government has increased the monthly rate of pay from \$6 to \$14—well above the average per capita income of the people as a whole.

A U.S.-financed television network is being set up to extend public education to every hamlet in the country. "Airborne classrooms" will be broadcasting courses to television receivers in community centers around the country. This new TV circuit represents an important advance in the war on ignorance as well as a way of answering the Communist propaganda being circulated by the Vietcong.

These are additional reasons why we must support H.R. 12169—to win the

peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, the request for supplemental AID appropriations which we are considering today will make possible the expansion of certain AID programs, particularly in the field of agriculture.

As a result of the President's Honolulu meeting with Premier Ky and the Vice President's tour through southeast Asia, the United States is planning to step up its programs of assistance to the rural areas of Vietnam.

In addition to the food-for-freedom program, AID is already conducting numerous other programs to help raise the level of living of rural people in Vietnam. These existing programs will form the basis of the expanded programs.

In Vietnam today, AID is conducting programs in four agricultural subject-matter areas as follows: First, agricultural service and extension; second, crops and livestock production; third, credit and cooperatives; and fourth, agricultural resources development.

Some accomplishments to date are:

First. Extension training: The 1,004 Vietnamese agricultural extension agents have received valuable training from AID specialists through a systematic in-service training program. After having their own skills upgraded, these Vietnamese extension workers have assisted 1 million farmers in increasing their agricultural production and in raising their level of living.

Second. Assistance to youth: During 1965, the number of 4-T club members reached 46,454 in 1,200 clubs. These are the equivalent of 4-H Clubs in this country.

Third. Agricultural research: Since 1962, agricultural research stations released more than 20 high-yielding varieties of field crops and vegetables.

Fourth. Participant training: Between 1951 and 1965, 611 Vietnamese received special agricultural training in the United States or in a third country under the AID participant training program.

Fifth. Information program: In 1965, AID assisted the GVN in producing over 3 million leaflets and booklets and over 230,000 posters and wall newspapers. Also, AID helped to produce 45 radio tapes, 514 radio broadcasts, and 22,000 technical magazines for use by professional agricultural workers.

Sixth. Sewing machines: In 1965, our AID mission distributed 1,000 sewing machines to needy rural families and

leaders.

Seventh. Fisheries: In the fisheries program, AID assisted in establishing 79 fishing cooperatives with 17,000 members. Also, fish production has increased from 52,000 tons in 1955, valued at VN\$3.3 billion, to 368,000 tons in 1965, valued at VN\$15 billion. Approximately 10,500 powered junks are now in operation, an increase of 6,900 since 1962, and 50,000 sets of improved fishing gear have been distributed. There are now 15 fishlanding facilities to assist marine fishermen.

Eighth. Livestock: Swine production increased from 1,694,000 head in 1955 to 3,600,000 in 1964. The chicken population increased from 16,655,000 in 1960 to 22,401,000 in 1964. About 33,000 improved chickens and 315,000 hatching eggs were distributed or sold at nominal prices from January 1964 to May 1965. There are 27 commercial farms with an average flock of 5,000 birds each.

Ninth. Fertilizer: Approximately 276,-000 metric tons of fertilizer were imported in fiscal year 1965 as compared to 42,877 metric tons in 1955. This fertilizer was used by 700,000 farmers on about 2 million acres and provided approximately VN\$1.5 million additional farm income.

Tenth. Plant protection: For the purpose of increasing agricultural production, assistance was given in setting up a plant protection service, training the local staff, and providing necessary equipment. Through this system, crop losses from insects, diseases, and rats were reduced by 50 percent between 1961 and 1965. About 360,000 farmers participated in antirat campaigns in 1964 using 39,000 tons of rat poison. They killed an estimated 38 million rats, saving about 95,000 tons of food. In 1964, about 600 tons of insecticides were used by 500,000 rice farmers and 2,000 vegetable farmers. The program saved about 150,000 tons of rice.

Eleventh. Irrigation and water resources: Since 1954, improved practices in irrigation canals, flood protection, and salt water control have been applied to 610,000 acres. In 1965, approximately 24 miles of new irrigation canals were completed and 5 miles rehabilitated; 42 dams were built or restored which benefited 27,740 acres of land.

These accomplishments under existing AID agricultural programs should be a source of pride and satisfaction to all of us. Our affirmative vote on this request for supplemental appropriations will make possible the expansion of these

vital programs and bring new hope and progress to the rural people of Vietnam.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the measure before the House of Representatives, H.R. 12169 to authorize appropriations of supplemental funds of \$415 million for fiscal year 1966 for economic assistance programs.

The funds previously appropriated to AID for this fiscal year have not met the needs in a few of the important danger areas of the world, particularly Vietnam, for which the bill now under consideration provides \$275 million in supporting assistance funds.

We know that the problem in South Vietnam is the determined effort of North Vietnam to impose its will by force. We know that Hanoi has sent arms, and tens of thousands of armed and trained men-including units of the North Vietnamese Regular Army-into South Vietnam. This is why U.S. forces are in that country. We will continue to repel this aggression while we persist in our efforts toward a peaceful solution. These efforts to date have been numerous, and in the past months have been carried into every major capital of the world. They have brought no encouraging response from Hanoi. Even while we halted our bombing of North Vietnam, the military operations of the north continued.

The expansion of Communist aggression has called for the increased military response of the United States and, thus, added to the task of AID. Our economic assistance programs in South Vietnam are as important as our military assistance. We must, together with other free nations of the world, reinforce economic and social progress in that country, so that a social revolution—as well as peace and freedom—can be obtained in southeast Asia.

I have said that the funds appropriated by Congress have not met the needs of AID; in fact, they do not cover even one-half of the currently estimated requirements for fiscal year 1966. Two principal elements are involved in the request for supplemental funds: First, to meet the rising threat of inflation, \$175 million is needed to finance the importation of food, drugs, and other commodities; and second, \$100 million is required for new or enlarged Government activities in rural areas.

I also support the request for the following additional funds included in H.R. 12169: First, \$7.5 million each in supporting assistance for Thailand and Laos, to assist them in developing and maintaining economic and political stability, and to withstand increasing Communist pressures; second, \$25 million for the Dominican Republic, where last April's revolution resulted in economic and political instability, and where wewith the Organization of American States-are determined to help the provisional government reach a stable environment prior to the coming elections; and third, \$100 million to replenish the now-exhausted AID contingency fund.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure in its entirety.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the Republic of Vietnam is presently engaged in a courageous struggle for survival

against the threat of Communist subversion. Despite the long and difficult war, the Vietnamese are determined to create a new nation, and the institutions essential to sustain that nation, during the years ahead. Whether you talk to a farmer working in the ricefields or to a high Government official, you will quickly learn that the people of Vietnam place a high value upon educational oppor-Consequently, the war against tunity the Vietcong has not obliterated this goal or weakened the resolve of the people to improve educational opportunity. Instead, it has created a strong sense of urgency which is shared by both the Vietnamese Ministry of Education and the ATD mission

The program of educational assistance, which was conceived jointly by the representatives of Vietnam and the United States, has been characterized by two approaches. First, a long-range program was organized to develop a system of education which will produce the trained manpower required for social and economic progress. This system is planned not only to facilitate the transfer of knowledge and the training of skills, but also to assist in creating a society which will initiate and successfully absorb social and economic change.

A second major thrust has been the development of a special-impact program which offers the benefits of education to rural people. This program has limited, immediately attainable goals and will offer tangible evidence to the Vietnamese villagers that their government is interested in their welfare and is utilizing its resources and personnel to meet their needs.

With these two approaches in mind, AID's educational assistance to the Republic of Vietnam has been largely concentrated in four principal projects: First, hamlet schools; second, instructional materials; third, vocational education; and fourth, teacher training.

The hamlet school program was initiated in 1963 to expand elementary educational opportunities as rapidly as possible. This grassroots project has resulted in 3,203 classrooms in addition to 1,600 selfhelp classrooms that were constructed by the villagers themselves. More than 5,000 teachers have been trained through special 90-day courses. Programs for 1966, 1967, and 1968 call for annual goals of 2,500 classrooms and 4,000 teachers. At the ratio of 60 children per classroom—the typical class size in Vietnamthis program has provided schooling for 320,000 Vietnamese boys and girls. In the future, thanks to the AID program, many thousands more will have their first opportunity to attend school.

In a typical Vietnamese classroom, the children do not have books. To correct this situation, an instructional materials project was organized to provide textbooks and other educational aids such as maps and charts. Committees composed of Vietnamese teachers, artists, and editors, with an American adviser, have produced manuscripts at a phenomenal rate in fields such as arithmetic, health, history, and geography. These books were printed in Manila, Hong Kong, and Saigon. The Republic of China has printed

500,000. Australia will print and deliver 1,200,000 this spring. All together, more than 7 million books have been printed and shipped to Vietnam. In 1966, an additional 5 million will be printed and delivered. For an average of 22 cents per copy, more than 1,600,000 Vietnamese children will carry these books into hamlets and homes throughout the 43 provinces of Vietnam, offering visible proof to their inhabitants that the Government of Vietnam and the people of the United States share a deep concern for their future.

Within the framework of vocational education, the Republic of Vietnam has been assisted in four major divisions of training. In the trade-technical program, AID has constructed, equipped, and developed four polytechnic schools which will each accommodate 800 students. These schools offer courses in fields such as forging and welding, machine shop, auto mechanics, electricity, woodworking, drafting, and diesel mechanics. More than 3,000 students are enrolled in these schools.

At the Phu Tho Polytechnic School in Saigon, 4-year and 2-year college-level teacher training courses have been established, under the competent advisory assistance of the Southern Illinois University contract team, which will make Vietnam largely self-sufficient in the training of vocational teachers and eliminate the need for an extensive program of study in the United States.

More than 6,635 Vietnamese students are enrolled in all types of secondary level trade and technical schools. With continued support of the existing programs, and the development of short-term trade training programs, over 10,000 students will be provided with an opportunity to acquire useful skills.

In the field of agriculture, 3 secondary schools—with an enrollment of 1,300 students—have been established with AID assistance. In Saigon, a college of agriculture, with an enrollment of 320 students, offers a 4-year curriculum which includes courses in the general fields of animal husbandry, horticulture, agronomy and agricultural engineering. These schools will be expanded and improved in future years.

Presently under construction are 20 2-year rural trade schools which will offer courses to elementary school graduates as well as short-term courses for adults and out-of-school youths in carpentry, metalworking, bricklaying, masonry, engine mechanics, and handi-The basic purpose of these crafts. schools will be to meet local community needs rather than to follow a stereotyped national curriculum. Provision is made, however, for students to follow an educational program leading to secondary and higher education.

The Ban Me Thuot technical school, which is part of this program, offers a 4-year trade training program to elementary school graduates from the mountain Provinces of Kontum, Pleiku, Phu Bon, and Darlac. These courses are patterned to meet the unique needs of the Montagnards. Seventeen schools are now under construction with one, the Long Xuyen rural trade school, completed and in op-

eration. Each school will have an enrollment capacity of 300 to 400 students.

At present, there is only one engineer training institution in Vietnam, located at the National Technical Center at Phu Tho, Saigon. A 4-year curriculum is offered in electrical, civil, and mechanical engineering as well as a 3-year technician training program in these same areas. A 4-year marine navigation course is also offered. A new 3-year technician training course in chemical technology was opened in fiscal year 1964. Currently, there are 792 students enrolled in the entire college. A survey of engineering has been completed, and a program to improve the quality and quantity of the courses is now being considered.

Vietnam has received substantial assistance from AID in the field of teacher training. Four normal schools, which are capable of enrolling 2,100 prospective elementary teachers, have been built and equipped. A laboratory elementary school enrolling 450 children and an inservice center designed to upgrade teachers and administrators have also been completed. The teacher training program has been improved and expanded from a 1- to a 2-year program.

In the area of secondary education, improvements include the construction of new colleges of education, for training teachers, and attached model demonstration high schools at the Universities of Hue and Saigon. Now in full operation, these facilities will graduate over 500 new teachers annually. They will also provide comprehensive secondary school opportunities for more than 1,800 high school students in an environment featuring better methods of teaching. new approaches to curriculum, and innovations in administrative practices. Currently, 190 teaching candidates are enrolled in a special 1-year training program at the University of Saigon in an effort to expand educational opportunities in the first year of the secondary school program.

Despite the ravages of war, considerable progress has been made through the AID program in expanding and improving the educational opportunities of Vietnamese youth. It is obvious that additional efforts will be required if we are to fulfill the task of providing the human foundations to support the survival and growth of the courageous Vietnamese nation. I believe every American will welcome the opportunity to share in this task.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the supplemental economic aid appropriation for Vietnam. In our efforts to combat the so-called wars of national liberation," those thinly disguised but effective tools of the international Communist conspiracy to take over developing countries, we have come to realize that economic and social measures are equally, if not more important than military measures. This means that a very heavy responsibility devolves upon the civilian programs of counterinsurgency. The Agency for International Development has the largest share of this civilian responsibility. It deals with the very roots of insurgency in working to alleviate the grievances of the people on which the Communists capitalize in seeking and gaining support of the population in these "wars of national liberation."

In preventing, as well as in stopping, these Communist-operated political wars, the efforts of the AID are indispensable. In Vietnam, the AID has a specially designed and unique program for reinforcing our political and military efforts. Not only does it alleviate the suffering of hundreds of thousands of refugees, but it has programs for assisting the Government to be more responsive to the needs of its people and thereby demonstrate that our way of life in the free world offers a better alternative than communism.

Such things as self-help projects and medical care in the rural areas, in the districts and in the provinces, constitute an orderly social revolution and a reinforcement of the essential political development which is required to sustain military victory. Indeed, if we attain military victories, as we expect to con-tinue to do, they are in danger of going for naught, after blood and suffering on the part of our noble U.S. servicemen and the valiant armed forces of the Government of Vietnam, unless economic and social progress, such as that which is supported by the AID, is not only continued but accelerated. That would be made possible by our affirmative action on this supplemental appropriation for Vietnam.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, for the first time since I was elected to Congress I am going to support a foreign aid authorization bill.

When a nation is at war then it becomes mandatory we make every effort to win that war. I consider this bill an integral part of our effort to achieve peace in Vietnam.

In my mind these funds are essential to the success of our operations in Vietnam. I am convinced that to withhold such funds would mean a lessening of our chances of success. These funds are for import financing, for rural construction, for port expansion, for refugee relief, and for development. They have equal importance with our military effort itself.

The casting of this vote does not mean I have changed my view concerning many aspects of foreign aid. To the contrary, most of the criticisms I have made in the past years are still valid.

This vote is cast to support an extraordinary effort which our country is making and reflects extraordinary support of that effort.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, in considering the present legislation, I would like to point out what appears to be a significant and encouraging new U.S. foreign policy emphasis on active assistance in the process of peaceful social and political reform and economic development in southeast Asia.

Most Americans, I am sure, will applaud this hopeful sign of our determination to provide forward-looking leadership in that troubled part of the world for the struggle to conquer the age-old

enemies of hunger, disease, and ignorance, and to build the basis for democratic institutions and free elections.

This more positive attitude toward solving the problems of the underdeveloped world is certainly welcome, for it seems to represent a major public shift in our foreign policy approach. And it could well mean a move away from what had come to be viewed as a basically defensive post-Korean conflict stanceaimed primarily at stabilizing the status quo in Asia.

The new approach calls for a more dynamic attitude designed to help meet the rising expectations of Asia's restless millions by providing urgently needed self-help assistance in such important fields as education, health, agricultural production, industrial development, community water and sewage facilities, village security, refugee resettlement, and tax and land reform.

In addition, we are now actively promoting the spirit of regional cooperation in southeast Asia by participating in the huge Mekong River development project, which will provide tremendous power, irrigation, flood control, and related economic benefits to each of the neighboring Mekong Basin countries of Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam.

Another very promising endeavor which we are fully backing is the newly created 27-nation Asian Development Bank with headquarters in Manila. This further example of worthwhile regional cooperation may prove to be one of the most effective long-range financial tools to develop Asia's virtually boundless human and natural resources-and help lift the burden of poverty that has been her lot since ancient times.

A fourth new U.S. foreign policy initiative is also designed to meet the turbulent challenge of the emerging nations. This is the recently announced food-for-freedom program to greatly increase American agricultural exports to food-shortage countries.

Besides harnessing our own amazing food-producing capacity to help fulfill the immediate pressing needs of an exploding world population, this program will also serve as a means to stimulate expanded local food production in the underdeveloped nations themselves.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am, of course, vitally concerned with these significant events on the international scene, for they seem to foreshadow a more dynamic American leadership role in promoting the cause of freedom.

Success in this progressive and forward-looking program of social reform and economic development, together with an end to the conflict in Vietnam, could help build strong and firm foundations for peace among all the nations of the

For that reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to give their overwhelming support to the supplemental foreign assistance authorization measure presently before the House-as an expression of endorsement for this hopeful and encouraging development in American foreign policy.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time on this side.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "\$369,200,000" and substitute "\$684,200,000".

(b) In the first sentence, after "President" insert ", without regard to section 649,".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

"(c) Immediately after the first sentence,

insert the following:
"'Funds appropriated under this section after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in the following countries and within the following dollar limitations: Not to exceed \$275,000,000 shall be available solely for use in Vietnam, not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Laos, not to exceed \$7,500,-000 shall be available solely for use in Thailand, and not to exceed \$25,000,000 shall be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing whatever complicated about this amendment. It neither takes from nor adds to the dollar amounts. It simply earmarks the bulk of the funds contained in this bill for spending in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic, and not somewhere else in the world.

I call your attention again to the fact that in this bill there is not one word which designates the purpose for which these funds should be spent—the purpose that I am sure we in the House of Representatives intend that they should be spent.

It has been said it would be unrealistic to designate where these funds ought to be expanded. Well, nothing could be more realistic than to designate where they are to be expended. I would say to the gentleman who made that remark only a few moments ago that he serves on a committee which authorizes the expenditure of a good deal of money. have heard him quite often criticize the flexibility and castigate those on the majority side for failing to write into legislation restrictions on the expenditure of funds. I am surprised that here today that he would say it is unrealistic to specify where these funds are to be spent.

One of the purposes of this bill and one of the purposes of all bills authorizing the expenditure of funds is to direct how and where the money shall be spent. That is all my amendment does. thing less than that is an abdication of control on the part of the House of Representatives.

So I offer my amendment in the hope that the chairman will accept it and then we can go on from here.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will

the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. MORGAN. I wish the gentleman would examine very carefully what is involved here. I am sure he did not when he drew up his amendment consider the borrowed money, \$63 million and some hundred thousand that has already been borrowed in this program. \$27,700,000 from the International organizations and \$36 million from supporting assistance funds in other countries in southeast Asia. Now with the limitation imposed by the gentleman's amendment, you are going to bar absolutely the repayment of these bor-rowed funds amounting to almost \$64 million.

Mr. GROSS. This amendment makes available exactly the same amount of money as is made available in the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, but you put a limitation on it.

Mr. GROSS. All it does is to prohibit transferability, and put it to the use for which it is intended.

Mr. MORGAN. The way I read the gentleman's amendment, you provide not to exceed \$275 million solely for use in Vietnam, \$7.5 million for Laos and \$7.5 million in Thailand and not to exceed \$25 million to be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic. You have it tied down tight.

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. MORGAN. What are you going to do about the repayment of borrowed

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Iowa knows my position generally on the question of mutual security legislation throughout the years. He and I have had some differences in this regard. I am going to support this legislation, but I think the gentleman's amendment is sound and proper.

If I could make a suggestion to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the question that he raises-how would the AID agency repay to the one or more of the other programs from which funds have been borrowed to support the effort in Vietnam, I would suggest that the AID agency over the years has been very prolific in deobligating funds and reobligating them for other programs. is not an uncommon thing. This has been done many, many times. So I am certain that in this instance here, they could deobligate and they could reobligate from the funds that are then made available. This is done a hundred times a year or more by AID. I think it can be done here in these circumstances. I think in all honesty the gentleman from Iowa's amendment is a good one. It would more clearly identify specifically and spotlight where we are putting the money. I hope the gentleman will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should like to ask the gentleman-how can you borrow from an account when in the beginning it is appropriated in a lump sum and not earmarked for any project anywhere on the face of the earth? It is a lump sum appropriation and the administration could borrow from one fund to transfer from one fund. In reality under this appropriation they could justify the funds for a project in Vietnam and yet take it and build a summer resort in Morocco. Where are they borrowing from inasmuch as the funds are not earmarked to start with? What are you borrowing from? I think that is a question that should be answered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentle-

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Far be it from me to try to answer when there are Members here who are more expert than I am, but I believe the gentleman from Louisiana knows better than anybody that the \$3.2 billion—whatever the exact amount was that was made available for fiscal year 1966—was not all in one account. It was in several accounts and they do have the right to transfer from one to another. Perhaps that is what the chairman of the committee was referring to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate proceed for an additional minute.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I will agree to the request for the additional time, but if there are any further requests for extension of time, I shall object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. We do know that these funds are appropriated in lump-sum amounts. They are appropriated on an illustrative basis. The agency says, "We believe we need the money for these particular projects and these particular countries, but we have the right to spend the money anywhere we want to." I am making that as a statement of fact. In-asmuch as you do not allocate the funds, from what account are you going to borrow? I want that question answered, if I can get an answer.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the chairman of the committee will want to answer the question.

Mr. PASSMAN. It does not appear that he does.

Mr. GROSS. If the expenditure is not nailed down here and now they may well be borrowing this money for other purposes. As the gentleman has suggested, they may be borrowing it for the purpose of building summer resorts in Morocco.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think we would be establishing a very bad precedent here if we agreed to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, because down through the years in the foreign aid bill we have never specifically authorized x number of dollars for this country and y number of dollars for another and z number of dollars for another country.

If we start this, I promise you that there will be lobbyists around here lobbying for amounts of money for their countries the like of which we have never seen.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am sure that the gentleman recalls that a few years ago we did earmark money for Spain.

Mr. HAYS. That is correct, but I think it was a mistake. I think I voted for it at the time. Experience taught me that we ought not to do it, because the next year—I do not want to mention the countries by name—ambassadors from a half dozen other countries came to see me in an effort to earmark an amount of money for their countries. If we do so again, we will have lobbyists around here the like of which we have not seen before.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr HAYS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do you not think it would be better to have the lobbyists here than over in the State Department?

Mr. HAYS. No; and I will tell you why. First, I do not think they are over there. Second, I am even more interested in another point about the gentleman's amendment.

I was out there, and I am very much worried about what is going to happen in Thailand, because that is the next target. In fact, they are moving in there right now. They are moving in from the north and from the south. I do not know whether \$7.5 million is enough for Thailand or whether it is not. But I do not want to tie the hands of the administration so that if they decide they have to meet this threat and they have to meet it fast, they cannot do it.

We might very well want to take some of this \$275 million that the gentleman wants to earmark for South Vietnam and use it in Thailand.

I give the Thais pretty high marks because they have stood up against the Communists. They have really stood up against China.

There was a cartoon not long ago in a magazine that showed Chou En Lai and Mao Tse-tung looking at each other. One of them said, "I don't trust these Russians. They are too oriental."

I give the Thais high marks on that, too, because when the Chinese Ambassador—or at least I read this in the newspaper—called on the Prime Minister of Thailand to protest the use of the bases in Thailand for our Air Force, the Prime Minister looked at him straight in the eye and said, "You had better get some new spies. They are giving you wrong information. There are no American planes in this country."

In other words, he gave them back some of their own propaganda medicine, and I think it was good for them.

Of all the places I visited out there I was impressed about as much by the attitude of the Thais, who are a little country, who are close to the common frontier with the Chinese Communists, and who have not hesitated to stand up and be counted on our side. I do not want any amendments that will hamstring us if we in an emergency have to give them more than this amendment would earmark for them.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Is it not true that as far as the borrowing is concerned, this money was borrowed from projects already programed and not expended?

Mr. HAYS. That is exactly correct.
Mrs. KELLY. Following that up, is it
not possible that if agreed to, the amendment would limit any further appropriation or authorization under this basic

law for the rest of this year?

Mr. HAYS. It would certainly limit it, and it might put more money than the gentleman from Iowa wants in the one place and less in another, depending on how much they have borrowed from these obligated funds and already obligated somewhere else. I do not think this is a very complicated situation.

Mr. ADAIR. There has been concern expressed here earlier today lest this money which is to go to southeast Asia should be diverted elsewhere. It is not the intent of the gentleman from Ohio that this money is in fact to be used in southeast Asia in furtherance of our effort?

Mr. HAYS. Certainly it is my intent that it is to be used in southeast Asia. I do not go so far on any appropriation as to say that, if the Chinese Communists attack in India, which is in southeast Asia, we could not use some of it there. It is not mentioned here, but we might. But I am sure it is the intent of all of us that it be used in southeast Asia, and in the Dominican Republic, which has been mentioned. But certainly I do not think that we ought to tie it down country by country and say "You are going to get so much" and "You are going to get so much."

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us—an AID supplemental request for \$415 million—involves economic assistance funds. Because of the saddening death of Admiral Nimitz, we are not now considering the Department of Defense supplemental request.

Most of the funds requested—\$275 million in supporting assistance—will be used in Vietnam. While this is a much smaller amount than the funds required to continue our military effort, it is every

bit as important.

The challenge in Vietnam is not simply a military challenge; it is economic and political. The brave people of South Vietnam must know that their hard struggle will result in a better future—their future and their children's future.

The farmers, schoolteachers, merchants, workers, mothers, students and soldiers must see that the seductions of the Communists are illusory; they must see that a future in independence and freedom will secure the benefits of social justice and growing prosperity—more schools, better health facilities, thriving farms, rising incomes and opportunity to advance.

I regard the additional funds requested by AID for use in Vietnam as indispensable to the efforts by the South Vietnamese themselves to secure this future. Secretary Rusk has already testified to

the Foreign Affairs Committee:

Without our AID programs we could win the major military battles in Vietnam and still lose the war and the peace.

Secretary Rusk added:

For this reason I regard our economic assistance program, although not nearly so large in scale, as equal in importance with our military assistance. We fully intend to reinforce the economic and social progress that South Vietnam has been making during a brutal war and in spite of unremitting destructive efforts by the enemy.

One hundred million dollars of this request for additional economic assistance funds for Vietnam is for rural construction and counterinsurgency activities. More than two-thirds of the funds for these projects will be used for activities outside Saigon.

These funds will be used for a variety of provincial operations. They are administered under exceedingly dangerous circumstances by some very brave AID

representatives.

These funds will be used for rural schools, to complete the construction of 15 rural trade schools, and about 830 hamlet school classrooms. They will be used to repair many other schools which have been either destroyed or damaged by the Vietcong. AID expects that during the next 3 years, it will be possible to build 3,700 new classrooms and train 12,000 teachers. I cannot imagine a better way to demonstrate to the Vietnamese the benefits of a free and secure future.

About \$9 million is needed for the expansion of rural health facilities in Vietnam. Most hospitals in the provinces are simply inadequate. They are old, outmoded or deficient in essential requirements. Through AID programs, new hospitals are built. Additional funds are needed to support surgical

teams on detail to AID to assist provincial hospital operations.

Expanded assistance for agricultural improvements is also required. Our efforts in this area is one of the key tools in the campaign to win the support of the people. Agriculture and agricultural programs have suffered terribly from the savagery of the war. The Vietnamese farmers' land is often the battle scene; the agricultural technicians' access to the farmer is often limited by Vietcong activities. In spite of these great obstacles, some remarkable successes are being achieved through AID programs; progress must continue.

The list of AID efforts to improve the lives of the Vietnamese and support the war effort is long. Funds are needed for basic improvements in several municipal centers of South Vietnam, such as lowcost housing and sewerage and drainage requirements. Relief for refugees must be expanded. Warehouses must be built and ships leased for coastal and ocean supply operations; war-damaged rail facilities must be repaired; it is necessary to install temporary and permanent electric power services and construct workers' housing and training centers. Public safety and police improvement activities must be accelerated to help establish adequate levels of physical security for the Vietnamese people.

The \$175 million is also needed by AID in this fiscal year to help finance commodity imports to combat inflation. To cope with the severe inflationary pressures which threaten economic and political stability, the United States must expand the financing of commercial imports. For example, \$21 million is needed for rice imports; \$9 million for medicines and pharmaceuticals; \$12 million for petroleum products; \$50 million for iron and steel, and \$4.5 million for fertilizer imports. Over half of these commodities will be utilized in areas outside Saigon. Without this vital assistance, destructive inflation would overcome our efforts to maintain a sound economy in Vietnam in the midst of the war.

It cannot be denied that all of these requirements are expensive. It likewise cannot be denied that they are necessary if we are faithfully to support the aspirations of the Vietnamese people for a better life and support the valiant efforts of our own fighting men in Vietnam to win this future. There is no alternative—except defeat and surrender in this beleaguered land—to meeting this situation by providing the President the funds which are needed to do the job now.

The bill before you also contains requests for supporting assistance funds for three other troubled lands: Thailand, Laos, and the Dominican Republic-\$7.5 million are needed for Laos and Thailand each. In these countries, the peoples are faced with increasingly menacing Communist pressures. Funds are needed now to meet these threats by increasing non-military security activities financed by AID and intensifying rural development projects in vulnerable areas. In Thailand additional funds are required now to assist the Government of Thailand in its major expansion of the civil police program. To improve the effectiveness of the border patrol and provincial police in combating Communist infiltration, additional helicopter, radio communications and weapons support is needed. Steps are also being taken to meet increasingly the needs of the rural populace, especially in the threatened northeast area of Thailand, by, for example, bringing potable water facilities to the villages there. This surely is the way to build the foundations of resistance to Communist intrusions.

In Laos new moneys are needed to attend to a variety of unanticipated needs. Refugee relief must be accelerated, airlift operations stepped up, and airport facilities improved. Additional funds for this year are needed to help the Government of Laos stabilize its influence and control in contested areas, especially through work with rural peoples.

In the Dominican Republic the United States has a vital interest in the realization of the elections which are now planned for June. The United States has provided large amounts of assistance to prevent the aggravation of the economic and political instability which followed last year's revolution. We must continue to provide budget support if we are to help the provisional government avoid the kind of chaos which would destroy the possibility of meaningful elections—\$25 million are needed in the next 4 months to foster a stable environment in the Dominican Republic.

The President has also requested Congress to provide AID with \$100 million in contingency funds to replenish funds already exhausted through use in emergency and trouble spots around the world. I heard Secretary Rusk when he testified:

It is absolutely essential that a sufficient amount of contingency funds be on hand for the remainder of this fiscal year to permit us to respond immediately and effectively to emergency situations or unforeseen requirements which engage the interests of the United States.

It is impossible to predict precisely if all these funds will be used or where they will be used. The point is that we must be prepared to deal decisively with unforeseen crises in southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America, or wherever.

I would like to comment briefly on some of the supplemental views expressed by five minority members of the committee.

These gentlemen express concern about "graft, corruption and black mar-ket activities." These are real problems in the wartime situation of Vietnam. But the impression should not remain that the Vietnamese leadership is corrupt or indifferent to crime or that the management of U.S. military or AID efforts in Vietnam is lax. There are two distinct types of problems which occur in a large-scale war effort such as now exists in Vietnam. First is diversion or corruption involving our assistance programs. AID's auditors and end-use inspectors are in Vietnam working to keep such diversion to a minimum. record is good. As a matter of fact, the Controller of the Agency is in Vietnam right now reviewing and improving audit and inspection procedures.

The second type of problem is profiteering, black market operations and corruption in the economy itself. Many of the charges and reports concern this type of problem. Vietnamese civil authorities are being assisted by American police advisers in a major campaign to deal with such corruption. It is occurring—but it is being vigorously attacked.

The supplemental views question the need for additional funds for the contingency fund. They point out that none of the original \$50 million has been used in Vietnam. They do not mention the \$89 million special fiscal year 1966 contingency fund for southeast Asiawhich has been needed and used in Vietnam-and which has been exhausted. I am sure that criticism would not be slow to come if the United States were not to deal effectively and promptly with emergencies and crises which might arise during the remainder of the year. As the supplemental views admit, contingency funds are not always fully used. As a matter of fact, AID has a good record since 1961 of not using contingency funds if they are not needed. If funds are left over, it is up to the Congress to reappropriate or not-and I am sure we can make that choice when the time comes

The supplemental views complain of manipulation of funds by AID's borrowings from other programs to meet needs in Vietnam. They suggest that borrowing is evidence of over-funding of other programs. This is simply not the case.

What AID has done is "borrow" from

What AID has done is "borrow" from programs where funds were not needed until the last part of the year. These borrowed funds will need to be replensihed—some of them by the end of March.

The borrowing that has been done is in full compliance with the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act—provisions enacted by the Congress. Each of these has required a determination by the President that the transfer is necessary. And who can dispute the necessity of meeting urgent requirements in Vietnam.

I am pleased to note—at least from their statement that they are "in agreement with the majority of our colleagues"—that these gentlemen do intend to vote in favor of a foreign aid authorization. I commend them for it.

Mr. Chairman, the world we inhabit is precarious and fragile. Most all of us recognize the world responsibility as a world climate of stability and security, of progress and hope. We also recognize that the price for bearing these responsibilities is not cheap, and the best evidence of this recognition would be a vote in favor of the supplemental request at hand. Those funds for economic assistance support in the truest sense our own best aspirations for the world in which we live.

The cruel dilemma of Vietnam hangs heavy over our Nation. It hangs heaviest over the head of President Johnson. Everyone can criticize or offer suggestions as to what should or can be done. However in the end the burden is his. The people of this country elected him our President and our Commander in

Chief. His judgment has never proven unworthy of the trust which the people of this country placed in him.

Some ask how did we get to Vietnam and this is a fair question that should be answered. Perhaps it is a time to trace the course which lead to Vietnam and place it in its proper perspective.

The Eisenhower administration on numerous occasions stated unequivocally that southeast Asia was of prime strategic meaning to the United States and that a threat to that region or to any one of the component countries, would also represent a threat to the security of the United States. In that period, when the Korean experience was quite fresh, aggressions against southeast Asia or Indochina were equated with the aggression against Korea in terms of significance to the United States and the free world.

In September of 1953 Secretary Dulles declared that the outcome of the struggle in Indochina "affects our own vital interests in the Western Pacific." In a speech 6 months later, Dulles referred first to the resources of southeast Asia and then stated:

The area has great strategic value. Southeast Asia is astride the most direct and best developed sea and air routes between the Pacific and south Asia. It has major naval and air bases. Communist control of southeast Asia would carry a grave threat to the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, with whom we have treatles of mutual assistance. The entire Western Pacific area, including the so-called offshore island chain, would be strategically endangered.

President Eisenhower appraised the situation last Wednesday (March 24) when he said that the area is of "transcendent importance."

A little later, Dulles stated that Communist conquest of southeast Asia "would seriously imperil the free world position in the Western Pacific" and he then explained the importance of Vietnam to southeast Asia as a whole:

We realized that if Vietnam fell into hostile hands, and if the neighboring countries remained weak and divided, then the Communists could move on into all of southeast Asia. For these reasons, the Eisenhower administration from the outset gave particular attention to the problem of southeast Asia.

Secretary Dulles in subsequent speeches put his position even more clearly when he said on one occasion that Chinese Communist aggression in relation to the Pacific or southeast Asia area "would be a deliberate threat to the United States itself," and on another occasion:

Communist armed aggression in southeast Asia would in fact endanger our peace and security and call for counteraction on our part.

Somewhat later, toward the end of 1954 the Secretary, speaking on the SEATO Treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said that it would be reasonable to conclude if the Communists turned to armed attack in that region they were "starting on a course of action which is directly aimed at the United States; that we are the target."

Once more in 1959, when evidence began to come to light that North Vietnam was renewing its efforts to take over the south, President Eisenhower said:

The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom * * *. Our own national interests demand some help from us in sustaining in Vietnam the morale, the economic progress, and the military strength necessary to its continued existence in freedom.

It was in an awareness of this real interrelation of the security of the United States with that of southeast Asia that the U.S. Government negotiated and concluded the Southeast Asia Collective Defense—Manila—Treaty in 1954. This treaty which established the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, with Thailand, the Philippines, Pakistan, Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States as members, was undertaken as a contract to defend southeast Asia. The nature of this contract will be discussed below.

The signers of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty for the United States were John Foster Dulles, H. Alexander Smith, and Mike J. Mansfield. With the advice and consent of the Senate, the treaty was ratified by the President on February 4, 1955, and entered into force on February 19, 1955.

Article IV of the treaty provides:

1. Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of United Nations.

2. If, in the opinion of any of the parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any party in the treaty area or of any other state or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.

3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any state designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

In a protocol entered into simultaneously the parties unanimously designated "for the purposes of article IV of the treaty the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam."

The United States, in a special understanding set forth in the treaty, limited its obligation "to act" under article IV(1) to cases of Communist aggression, including armed attacks by "the regime of Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam." The United States agreed in the event of other aggression or armed attack to consult under the provisions of article IV(2).

OBLIGATION TO ACT-INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE

In the event of armed attack as in Vietnam, each party is bound under article IV(1) to act "to meet the common danger." Article IV(2) "applies primarily to the threat of overthrow by subversive measures, internal revolution which might, perhaps, be inspired from without, but which does not involve open interference from without." This obligation is individual, as well as collective, and does not depend on consultations or agreement. This interpretation of the treaty obligation, widely held by the SEATO parties, was given formal expression in a joint communique issued by Secretary Rusk and Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman of Thailand on March 6,

The agreement of each of the parties to act to meet the common danger "in accordance with its constitutional processes" leaves to the judgment of each country the type of action to be taken in the event an armed attack occurs.

But each party is committed to act on its judgment that an armed attack has

The Secretary of State assured the Foreign Minister that in the event of such aggression, the United States intends to give full effect to its obligations under the treaty to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. The Secretary of State reaffirmed that this obligation of the United States does not depend on the prior agreement of all other parties to the treaty, since this treaty obligation is individual as well as collective.

Almost all the SEATO parties have endorsed this statement. None has registered objection.

In the current hostilities, the Republic of Vietnam has not requested formal collective action by the SEATO Council. However, at Vietnam's request, the United States has acted individually, and collectively with other countries, including several SEATO allies, to meet the common danger arising from the armed attack against "the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam." These measures are not actions by the SEATO Council, but they are actions in discharge of parties' obligations under the treaty.

SOUTHEAST ASIA-U.S. PEACE AND SECURITY

The meaning of the treaty commitment was underscored by Secretary Dulles in his report to the President:

The purpose of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty is the creation of unity for security and peace in southeast Asia and the Southwestern Pacific. * * Although the United States has no direct territorial interest in southeast Asia, we have much in common with the people and governments of this area and are united in the face of a common danger that stems from international communism.

A week after the treaty was signed, Secretary Dulles explained to the Nation:

Any significant expansion of the Communist world would, indeed, be a danger to the United States, because international communism thinks in terms of ultimately using its power position against the United States. Therefore, we could honestly say * * * that Communist armed aggression in southeast Asia would, in fact, en-

danger our peace and security and call for counteraction on our part.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Secretary Dulles said:

The language used here which has now become, I would say, almost conventional with reference to these treaties, makes perfectly clear the determination of our Nation to react to [Communist] armed at-

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reported the treaty and protocol by a vote of 14 to 1. In its report, the committee made clear its understanding of the importance of the new commitment:

This treaty constitutes an important step in the evolution of U.S. policy to create a system of collective security in the West Pacific area. It is the latest addition to the protective network of the mutual defense treaties which have been concluded by the United States with Japan, Australia and New Zealand, the Philippines and Korea.

Designed to promote security and to strengthen the fabric of peace in southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific, the treaty is intended to deter aggression in that area by warning potential aggressors that an open armed attack upon the territory of any of the parties will be regarded by each of them as dangerous to its own peace and safety.

The principle underlying this treaty is that advance notice of our intentions and the intentions of the nations associated with us may serve to deter potential aggressors from reckless action that could plunge the Pacific into war. To that end, the treaty makes it clear that the United States will not remain indifferent to conduct threatening the peace of southeast Asia.

The committee is not impervious to the risks which this treaty entails. It fully appreciates that acceptance of these obligations commits the United States to a course of action over a vast expanse of the Pacific. Yet these risks are consistent with our own highest interests. There are greater hazards in not advising a potential enemy of what he can expect of us, and in failing to disabuse him of assumptions which might lead to a miscalculation of our intentions.

For these reasons, the Committee on Foreign Relations urges the Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of this treaty.

On February 1, 1955, the U.S. Senate approved the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty by a vote of 82 to 1. Senator Langer cast the lone negative vote. Thirteen Senators were absent and not voting, but with respect to each it was announced that if present and voting, he would vote "yea." Among the 13, 2 Senators were absent for illness: Lyndon B. Johnson and John F. Kennedy. The others were Barkley, BEN-NETT, Chavez, Daniel, DIRKSEN, Hennings, HRUSKA, McCarthy, Monroney. Potter, and Young

The commitment to protect the Indochina states from Communist aggression was a central consideration emphasized by each of the four principal speakers in debate on the floor of the Senate supporting the treaty:

Senator George. The nations of the free world sustained a serious setback with the loss of northern Vietnam to the Communists. The peril to the southern area, the free territory of Vietnam, as well as to the remaining associated states. Laos and Cambodia, is serious, continuing, and unrelent-It is important that our Government should act promptly to give approval to this treaty as an act of confidence in the determination of other governments in the area to defend their freedom, individual liberty, and independence.

Senator SMITH. The net effect of this provision is to serve notice now and for the future to the Chinese Communists-and, I may say, to any Communists in the area * that they shall not encroach further on this area of free nations. They are no longer free to isolate and absorb the countries of southeast Asia, one by one. Laos or Cambodia or South Vietnam or Thailand cease to be individual entries on their timetable of conquest. That was taken care of by the special protocol which was added to the treaty at the time it was signed.

Senator Mansfield. The Southeast Asian Treaty is another part in the total pattern of strength which we have been trying to create throughout the free world. The armistice agreements at Geneva did not end the need for a pact in the southeast Pacific area; rather it emphasized it.

The treaty area is defined in the treaty itself and also in a protocol to the treaty which brings in Laos, Cambodia, and the free portion of Vietnam as treaty territory which, if attacked, would be under the protection of the treaty * * * those states welcomed the fact that the mantle of protection of the treaty was thrown around this area.

Senator Willey. We all know what the loss of that part of the globe would mean to our own security. And we must not weaken our own resolve at this critical moment. Recent information, in contrast with pessimistic advice received earlier, appears to offer greater hope for a favorable outcome in free Vietnam. Surely now is not the time to dampen the morale of its people and its leaders.

INDOCHINA

The Manila Pact was negotiated in the shadow of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Korea and Indochina. When the Geneva Agreements on Indochina were signed by the French military command and the Communist Vietminh, the threat was clear that the Communists might attempt to take over the whole of Vietnam by internal subversion or armed aggression. At the conclusion of the Geneva Conference President Eisenhower declared that the United States would "not use force to disturb the settlement," but he warned "that any renewal of Communist aggression would be viewed by us as a matter of grave concern." The formal declaration by the U.S. Government at the 1954 Geneva Conference was worded more strongly. It stated we 'would view any renewal of aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security."

At Manila, Secretary Dulles warned the conference of the insatiable ambition of international communism:

We know that wherever it makes gains, as in Indochina, these gains are looked on not as final solutions, but as bridgeheads for further gains.

It was to contain this bridgehead that the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was negotiated.

Secretary Dulles acknowledged that President Eisenhower and he "had hoped that unity would be forged in time to

strengthen the negotiating position of the free nations during the Indochina phase of the Geneva Conference. However, this proved impracticable. The Geneva outcome did, however, confirm the need for unity." The Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was fashioned to meet this need.

REAFFIRMATION OF THE COMMITMENT

The U.S. commitment to the defense of South Vietnam derives from a basic conviction that the vital interests of the United States are engaged in the struggle of the peoples of southeast Asia to build societies in their own way free from aggression from the Communist powers. This commitment has been reaffirmed by three Presidents. With the support of Congress, each took the action that was necessary in his time to honor that commitment.

As early as October 1, 1954, President Eisenhower undertook to provide direct assistance to help make South Vietnam "capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." On May 11, 1957, President Eisenhower and Ngo Dinh Diem, President of the Republic of Vietnam, issued a joint statement which noted "the large buildup of Vietnamese Communist military forces in North Vietnam" and stated, inter alia:

Noting that the Republic of Vietnam is covered by article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, President Eisenhower and President Ngo Dinh Diem agreed that aggression or subversion threatening the political independence of the Republic of Vietnam would be considered as endangering peace and stability.

The two Presidents "looked forward to an end of the unhappy division of the Vietnamese people and confirmed the determination of the two Governments to work together to seek suitable means to bring about the peaceful unification of Vietnam in freedom in accordance with the purpose and principles of the United Nations Charter."

As North Vietnam's aggression mounted, President Kennedy declared, on August 2, 1961:

The United States is determined that the Republic of Vietnam shall not be lost to the Communists for lack of any support which the United States can render.

On December 7, 1961, President Diem appealed for additional support to meet North Vietnam's efforts to impose a Communist regime. In his reply of December 14, 1961 President Kennedy recalled the U.S. Declaration at the Geneva Conference of 1954 and reaffirmed that the United States was "prepared to help the Republic of Vietnam to protect its people and to preserve its independence."

THE JOINT RESOLUTION OF AUGUST 7, 1964

President Johnson has reaffirmed these commitments many times, and, on August 7, 1964, the Congress adopted, by vote of 504 to 2, a joint resolution which stated the commitments as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

SEC. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

Sec. 3. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

During the floor debate, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations was asked by Senator Cooper whether the joint resolution fulfilled the requirement of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty that the United States act by constitutional processes:

In other words, are we now giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary respecting South Vietnam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT answered directly:

I think that is correct.

Mr. Cooper. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided it was necessary to use such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the way I would interpret it.

This provision is intended to give clearance to the President to use his discretion. We all hope and believe that the President will not use this discretion arbitrarily or irresponsibly. We know that he is accustomed to consulting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with congressional leaders. But he does not have to do that * * *. I have no doubt that the President will consult with Congress in case a major change in present policy becomes necessary.

The joint resolution of August 1964 decided that the United States is prepared "as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom." South Vietnam has asked for that assistance, and the President has taken the necessary steps in consultation with the Congress.

MUTUAL DEFENSE AGREEMENTS IN THE PACIFIC

The Manila Pact is only one of a number of bilateral and multilateral arrangements made to facilitate the exercise of the inherent right of collective self-defense acknowledged in article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The United States has entered into bilateral mutual defense treaties in the Pacific with Japan—most recently in 1960—Korea, 1953; the Philippines, 1954; and China, 1954; and it is a member of the tri-

partite Anzus pact with Australia and New Zealand, 1952.

Everyone of these treaties obligates the United States to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes—the formula used in the Manila Pact. This U.S. commitment, given in advance, to act in accordance with its constitutional processes in the event of Communist armed attack, is the linch-pin of the free world collective security system.

Thus U.S. commitment in South Vietnam, growing out of the Manila treaty and its protocol, must be met, in view of the aggression which is being mounted from North Vietnam, if the Manila treaty is to be regarded as a credible commitment. Were we not to help South Vietnam to defend itself, each one of the other SEATO nations which is under threat would most probably conclude that it could not count on American support, and we could expect to see accommodations being made to an aggressive communism which no one of the countries of southeast Asia could resist standing alone. Since our understandings with other allied countries in East and southeast Asia are stated in terms which are virtually identical to those in the Manila treaty, it is reasonable to assume that those countries too would feel obliged to reappraise their basic policies on the basis of a much more doubtful assumption of U.S. help in case they come under attack.

Under these circumstances we would have to assume that with the passage of time the bases in the Western Pacific to which we now have access would be shut off from us and that much territory and many resources now in friendly hands would no longer be so. Not only in that region but around the world the firm basis for the free world's system of collective security would have been badly if not irreparably shaken.

I think the vote today will demonstrate while we all seek peace we also possess an awareness of the commitment of this country. We have also a commitment to those young men who are doing the fighting that validates this commitment. They are entitled to our support.

The very risk that makes a treaty necessary in the first place carries with it the possibility that some day it may become operative. So too our responsibility becomes greater when our troops are committed to battle. Let us continue to discuss, let us continue to seek honorable negotiations but let us recognize that the answer to this challenge by communism like all its many challenges rests not with them. It rests with us.

Shall we continue to believe in ourselves? Shall we retain the faith of our convictions possessed of the knowledge that our ideals are more meaningful than our armies? Shall we retain our courage? For if we do then there is hope that Vietnam may be the dawn of a lasting peace in a world where men shall only fight their real enemies, misery, poverty, disease, and ignorance. I think we do.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to use the allotted time. I merely want to say, and I would like to add a footnote, that I have not studied this bill in detail. I do not know the fine points of it. I am not a member of the committee. But as I came in the door I heard the gentleman from Ohio make some remarks about the junior Senator from New York, and I might say that I am a good friend of the Senator from New York—

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman

from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman did not hear me correctly. I said the junior Senator from my own State. I do not bear any responsibility for the junior Senator from New York. I am a good friend of his, too.

Mr. DOW. Then I apologize.

Mr. HAYS. It is the junior Senator from Ohio that I was talking about.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I question the wisdom of my getting into this debate. I have profound respect for the distinguished chairman of this committee and every member of the subcommittee. It is his responsibility to get the authorization bill approved. Subsequently the Committee on Appropriations will have to consider the authorization.

I would like to be corrected if I am wrong. There is actually no borrowing going on anywhere. We may use the term "borrowing," but the allocation that the President made out of the United Organization funds is money that was unobligated. Had these funds been obligated, they could not have been retrieved. It was unobligated funds that the administration used, that is if they have been used. I am making a statement of fact, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course this money is already appropriated. The gentle-

man's bill appropriated it.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is not the question. Had it been allocated to specific projects?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course it has not been allocated to specific projects.

Mr. PASSMAN. Then you are not borrowing it, you are merely using funds that have not been obligated.

Mr. MORGAN. I am reading from the gentleman's own bill. International organization programs authorized by section 302, \$144,755,000. This is a program that they borrowed from.

I am reading now from the executive branch's section-by-section analysis that came up to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

AID has already "borrowed" \$36 million of essential supporting assistance programs and programs financed by the special southeast Asian contingency fund. In addition, \$27,700,000 has been temporarily transferred to supporting assistance from funds appropriated for volunteer contributions for international organizations.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, that is correct, but what you are actually doing is obligating funds for projects in South Vietnam from money that had not been obligated or turned over to

international organizations. I repeat, if the funds had been turned over to these international organizations they could not have been recalled or deobligated and reobligated as is the case with a multitude of other funds that are allocated or obligated on a bilateral basis, by the AID agency through the country and projects.

I just had a look at the budget. In the budget there are 15 different requests for foreign assistance of some type for fiscal year 1967. The total amount is \$8,505 million. I can assure the gentleman that this does not include any part of the Defense budget other than mutual security military assistance. May I say the total of unexpended funds from these 15 bills, to be dispersed in the future may exceed \$20 billion. The authorization request before you will merely enable the administration to increase the pipeline and I dare say not a dime authorized by this bill would actually be expended until 1968, if then.

The President laid the foundation for this supplemental when he came before the Congress last year. Read his message. He said that at some subsequent date, if we need the funds, we are going to ask Congress to appropriate them. I predicted at that time that there would be a supplemental in excess of \$1 billion, which would make it the largest foreign aid bill in the history of America if you picked up the international organizations and the other facets of foreign aid.

If the gentleman will accept this amendment and earmark these funds specifically for South Vietnam, for the first time since I have been a Member of Congress I will vote loud and clear for this particular authorization, but you have struck it out of the bill somewhere along the way. Some of you had the idea that you should earmark the funds in reading your own bill before the committee, but it has been stricken and again you are asking for an open end appropriation whereby you could or could not allocate and spend these funds in South Vietnam. Again it is on an illustrative basis. We may spend it there, but again we may not. So, if the gentleman will accept this amendment. inasmuch as he has made his case on the basis that the money was needed for South Vietnam, you will give some of us an opportunity to use the propaganda that is being used downtown that we are doing this on account of the war in South Vietnam. If that be true, then let us allocate it and let us put in the supplemental in the other body when it goes over sufficient money to pay back the pittance of \$64 million which you said we had borrowed. You have not borrowed it but have spent it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try to bring this argument back into focus. This amendment was never considered in committee. No one introduced it, including anyone in the minority. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman] is inaccurate in that particular statement.

Now let me say this: The programs had been scheduled on a 12-month basis. We still have 4 months to go. Ninety-

six million dollars has already been borrowed from programs that have been scheduled. Twenty-seven million dollars has been scheduled for the 12-month program of the international organizations. This includes a multitude of organizations that would be unfunded for the balance of the 4 months if this amendment were adopted. Second, \$60 million has been borrowed from the Korean funds.

Now, it makes no sense to talk about fighting communism in South Vietnam if we allow programs in Korea to go unfunded. The rigidity of this amendment would preclude the transferability of the funds that we have here and have borrowed under previously allotted sums of money for programs of supporting assistance that would be used in Korea. Further, barring unforeseen circumstances, these funds will be used for the purpose stated by the administration; that is, the United Nations, Laos, Thailand, the Dominican Republic, and to reimburse funds previously borrowed, as I have stated.

This is a tremendously rigid amendment which has never been passed by any previous Congress that has considered the foreign aid bill. It is possible emergency situations in Laos or Thailand might require some transfer of funds. If we adopted this particular amendment, we would be unable to shift funds from Thailand to Laos or from Vietnam to Laos or Thailand. We would be unable to shift funds to the Dominican Republic or, if we had no further need for funds in the Dominican Republic and had a greater need in South Vietnam for them, we would be unable to do that. So, to reimburse the \$96 million we have already borrowed and which the committee of the gentleman from Louisiana has appropriated, it seems to me we cannot adopt this amendment. Even if we were thinking about it, what we would be doing is starting down an entirely new path and setting rigid precedents that have never been imposed on any President in any previous administration. So this has not been a well thought out amendment. I am sure the purposes are sincere. We are voting to support our effort in South Vietnam, but let it not be so rigid that we cannot fight communism wherever the emergency arises. By adopting this amendment what we would be doing is putting some programs on an 8-month basis when they have been scheduled and programed on a 12-month basis.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I state again, and I am not quarreling with the gentleman, but the facts should be made known: You are not borrowing; you are merely allocating funds from previously appropriated, unobligated funds. You have nothing to pay back. I shall set forth that at the proper time.

If the gentleman will yield further, I want to ask one question: Using it in the extreme—I would not want to get into the hearings that are yet to be published—under the bill that is being con-

sidered, the authorization bill, if approved, funds out of this authorization could be allocated to Egypt, Indonesia, or any other of the 98 nations where foreign aid is being or could be dispersed in fiscal 1966, if the administration should so desire.

Is that not a statement of fact?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to answer the gentleman to the effect that the gentleman from Louisiana is quite aware of the program. But what we have done, in effect, is that while we might not have obligated these fundsand we are getting involved in semantics here—the fact of the matter is we have projected our program in Korea on a 12-month basis. We have borrowed \$60 million from that program. If we adopt this amendment, the rigidity of this amendment would preclude our paying back the supporting assistance fund in Korea the funds that we have already taken out of that fund to support our effort in South Vietnam. That is just how simple it is.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman did not answer my question, which is this: Could these funds be allocated to

Egypt and to Indonesia?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The question is that they could be allocated to Korea.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has made my point.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I came over to the floor of the House this afternoon with the intention of voting for H.R. 12169. But I find, without the amendment, it will be impossible for me to vote for the measure.

Mr. Chairman, I thought that this money was earmarked for South Vietnam or at least for southeast Asia. But instead of earmarking the authorization, the Committee has merely amended section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by raising supporting assistance from \$369,200,000 to \$684,200,000.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman], has raised a very valid objection. I have heard the gentleman from Louisiana say that the AID, the State Department, can obligate, reobligate, and deobligate all in the same day. If we pass this measure without earmarking the \$315 million for use in southeast Asia, the war in South Vietnam could end tomorrow and the State Department could spend all of the funds in Timbuktu the following week.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the authorization next week coming out of the House Committee on Armed Services. I serve on the House Committee on Armed Services. I raised a similar objection to the authorization in that committee. I feel that this is one of the valid objections to the operations of the foreign aid program. The Congress just does not exercise control over the operations of the foreign aid program. If this money is for use in southeast Asia, why should there be any objection to earmarking.

In my opinion—and I have been watching this for 6 years now in the

House of Representatives—it is an absolute exercise in futility for us to go through the procedure of authorizing and appropriating, when the State Department can obligate, deobligate, and reobligate all in the same day.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would say that we have the same problem with reference to the defense apppropriation, because the Pentagon and the Defense Department is doing the same thing through the process of reprograming.

Now I did vote for the authorization in the Committee on Armed Services. That will be before the committee next week, but the problems are completely different. You can buy a bomb in the United States but you do not know whether it will be dropped in North Vietnam, South Vietnam, or Laos. But here we can exercise control at least to the extent of having it spent in Laos and Thailand and South Vietnam, which is the reason why the President has asked for this authorization.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to have one more clarification of this bill. I respect this great committee but as I understand the situation, no money has been "borrowed." I am familiar with this procedure. Actually what has happened and what does happen is that they allocated money or funded programs for South Vietnam that would have normally been allocated to other projects, programs, or countries. It is just a question now of whether you are going to get more money to allocate funds to Korea and to other programs that have been temporarily underfunded. Had the money been obligated then, of course, they could not have allocated it to another program or country. In reality the AID has not borrowed money. It makes a good case of argument but it is not factual. The AID is merely allocating funds that normally would have gone to some other country. If this authorization bill is approved, they will merely fund these programs at a subsequent date.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Do I understand the gentleman to say during the gentleman's discussion of this amendment that he is going to favor the same kind of amendment to the bill, H.R. 12335, when it comes on the floor Tueday?

Mr. ICHORD. No. I do not think you could possibly limit the effort in fighting a war. I do think we should try to exercise more control even in the Committee on Armed Services. But when you are spending money for construction of airfields and for the purchase of numerous weapons and many new weapons that we are going to have come into play in South Vietnam, I do not think we can possibly earmark our authorization. We have made some progress, I will say to the gentleman, in the Committee on Armed Services. We did extend last year the authorization for line items to

include track vehicles. Previously we only authorized specifically for missiles, aircraft, ships, and other large items of hardware.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.
Mr. Chairman, for 12 years I was a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Each year we had to consider the necessary appropriations for the funding of the total mutual security and/or AID program. In the process of considering this program, every year you ran into these kinds of terms. The executive branch of the Government would come before the committee and say, On an illustrative basis we are asking for this much money.

They could not be specific in pointing out the precise dollars for a precise project. The presentation was always illustrative. Each would also tell us that after the money was made available or the obligational authority was forthcoming, then they would program something—the precise dollar against a precise program.

Then they would eventually obligate the precise obligational authority against the project in a country. This was normal procedure. Then, of course, it was just as normal to deobligate if a project fell through or if its justification was not warranted after further consideration. Then that obligational authority would be made available for another project in another country and there would be a reobligation.

Now when comments are made that money is borrowed from one program or project from one country or another, I suspect—and I would like to see the books—that they had gone no further than programing at this stage of the fiscal year. Even if they had, knowing full well they will get this authorization and this appropriation—and I am for them—they can deobligate and they can reobligate. The net result will be purely a bookkeeping transaction.

It would be very interesting if the books were up here and we had people to look at them. I suspect the facts are they have gone no further than the programing. Even though they have they can deobligate and if they can deobligate, they can reobligate.

Let me just conclude with this observation, Mr. Chairman. It has been pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that this is an unusual circumstance. I agree. Maybe the fact that it is an unusual circumstance is the reason why we should earmark. It would justify earmarking here when we have not done so in the past. We are seeking on this occasion to indicate our full support for our program in Vietnam and in these associated areas in southeast Asia.

There is no better way in my judgment than to be specific with the earmarking as long as we are convinced that the earmarking will in no way interfere with the operation of the program.

I am confident if the books were laid right out on the table in the well of the House, the facts would be—yes the facts would be—that they have not gone any further than the programing. If they had, they can deobligate and reobligate to take care of any borrowing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the

gentleman has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in

opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all as far as the semantics are concerned with respect to resupplying existing programs. We have authorized and appropriated funds on an illustrative basis for programs for the present fiscal year under the regular program. If it becomes necessary, even as a contingency, that it may be required to use some of these funds to finish out the present fiscal year, it would be my purpose in supporting this authorization to be sure that those funds previously authorized and appropriated would not be disturbed or that we would have to modify existing previously approved programs.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to our distin-

guished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I rise only for the purpose of trying to clarify the general situation here. I have not worked with these figures as many Members have. But it is my understanding that this so-called loan or deobligation or whatever it is was made from the Fund for International Organizations and Programs, and that the sum total of that Fund, if I read the correct figure, is \$144 million-plus. I also understand that that Fund involves obligations of the U.S. Government in connection with our contributions to various agencies and that these obligations are fixed.

If that is true—and I am merely rising for information—we would want to put the money back as contemplated in this bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida vield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To a degree I am asking for information, too. It is my best recollection that the appropriations for the fiscal year 1966 for the international organizations were—and this was a separate amount—100 million-plus—and that that money could not be transferred out of that to help fund to the extent of the full amount.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield further?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I understand that that \$27.6 million was taken from that specific fund, the entire amount of which is an obligation to the United States. That

is my understanding.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey because I promised him I would do so, but I would like to proceed with what I started to say on my own time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The debate today indicates what I said earlier, and that is we are being unrealistic if we are suggesting that there is any necessity right now to earmark these particular funds in the way that is being proposed by this amendment. I think we might have less reason to hesitate about earmarking them than we have had. But there is no need for it in this case. We are talking about a 4-month program. That means surely there will be a dislocation of existing programs if we do not have the flexibility which socalled open-ended authorization would provide in this 4-month period. Had we had discussion like this in the committee, we might have come up with a different conclusion. More difficulty would arise if we should now say that these funds can only be allocated in certain amounts as to certain countries. Mr.

FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to complete what I intended to say, and if there is any time remaining, I shall be glad to yield to those desiring me to do so. I understood the statement to be made on the floor that the committee had earmarked funds for a particular country in this bill for the general program and that subsequently we struck that out. I cannot find that language anywhere in this bill. It was not brought up in committee, and there was no amendment to that effect. did have a country earmarking with respect to administrative expenses and the transferability for that purpose. put a ceiling and a limitation on those funds, but not on the others. In my judgment, this is no time to talk about changing the whole concept of authorization and appropriation, at a time when it is clear we do not need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the

gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 52, noes 71.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gross and Mr. Gallagher.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 73, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following: "Sec. 2. Of the funds appropriated under

"Sec. 2. Of the funds appropriated under the amendment made by the first section of this act not to exceed \$25 million shall be available for use in the Dominican Republic on a loan basis."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is not to change the amount but simply to see that the amount listed in

the report and hearings for the Dominican Republic should be certain to be on a loan basis. By that I mean the adoption by Congress of a loan rather than a grant policy for capital expenditures on U.S. foreign aid. The question comes up as to how much has the Dominican Republic received from the United States in grants and loans from the time of the revolution. Since the date of the revolution, on April 24, 1965, the United States has made available to the Dominican Republic \$86.3 million until January 10 of 1966.

There is now in the current President's contingency fund \$54.1 million of un-obligated funds. As of now, \$37,322,000 of this current contingency fund has been allocated to the Dominican Republic, most of which is for their budget use for the Government. I am not allowed to give you the specific amounts as distributed in the Dominican Republic, although I can hardly see why the information is confidential when the Vietnam listing by category is given and the United States is at war there.

This makes a total already of \$123,-622,000 U.S. credits made available to the Dominican Republic since April 24, 1965. That is pretty good financing for a revolution in these short months.

The President now requests for the Dominican Republic another authorization of \$25 million. The question is should Congress make this a grant or a loan by specific designation, or just leave the question open? My position is that these funds should be a loan. The reasons for that position are these: First, they have a low rate of savings and investments in the Dominican Republic. The people are not seriously helping themselves, and we U.S. taxpayers should insist on their doing so.

The second point is that the Dominican Republic has not yet changed their agricultural program to meet present realities and market conditions, so that they vary their Dominican exports. They are still emphasizing sugar heavily and cocoa, which is in excess and overabundant supply at world market prices that are low.

The third point is that the U.S. taxpayers should insist that the Government of the Dominican Republic emphasize the free enterprise system and get out of its many businesses. There are too many businesses in the Dominican Republic that are owned and operated by the Dominican Republic. Too large a part of the businesses are governmentowned or operated. My position is: Congress should definitely state the U.S. policy that this \$25 million is a loan. We can make it on a 40-year basis from the U.S. Treasury, the first 10 years at 1 percent interest and the remaining 30 years at 21/2 percent interest. The U.S. statutes already authorize that procedure generally.

As to the current Dominican budget and their loans, of June 30, 1965, the Government owes \$30 million to foreign commercial banks on terms of 1 year or less. On a 1-to-8-year basis of maturities, the Dominican Government owes approximately \$153.5 million. If Congress or the administration puts the \$25

million in cash as a grant to the Dominican Republic, all the U.S. tax-payers are doing is picking up the tab for \$25 million of the \$30 million of the loans of the foreign banks which are due on the current under-1-year basis.

How about Dominican foreign loans that have maturities over 1 to 8 years? On those loans there is money owed to the U.S. Treasury, the International Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. On Dominican loans with over 8 years maturity, there is money owing, but that is to U.S. AID, the Inter-American Bank, U.S. Treasury under Public Law 480, section 4, and also the Export-Import Bank. So actually U.S. institutions are owed most of the long-term Dominican obligations. My object is to serve notice to the Dominican people and their Government to get their economic and budget houses in order. Revolutions are expensive.

My question is, Why, when it is stated that this \$25 million is for capital funds in large part, capital budget expenditures, does Congress not specifically label and treat it then as capital investment? Mr. Bell, Director of U.S. AID, stated on page 20 of the hearings, regarding Dominican aid:

Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development, to technical assistance, etc.

Under those circumstances, as this is capital investment, then Congress should specifically treat the \$25 million as a capital loan and lend it on a long-term, 40-year basis.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I wonder what is the reason for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am reading from page 100 of the hearings and from the colloquy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] and Mr. Sternfeld, who came up to testify before us:

Mr. Fulton. The question comes whether Congress should not now, at this time, make U.S. supporting assistance on a loan, rather than a grant base, rather than adopt the policy to have loans in the future after these grants.

Mr. Sternfeld. That is our proposition, Mr. Fulton. It is our intention that the \$25 million we are requesting here will be provided to the Government on a loan basis, at this time.

Mr. Fulton. So that there is no more aid going to the Dominican Republic on a grant basis?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. I just cannot understand why the gentleman himself, since he raised this at the hearings, would appear on the floor and offer an amendment to this effect.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Well, the answer to it is this: Unless we in Congress specifically say that this loan policy is the intent of the Congress, I think they will change it and move it around and make it on a grant basis. So I am simply tying this commitment down based upon what the administration said in answer to me, that it will be a loan, and that we in Congress adopt a policy right now of having loans for the Dominican Republic for capital expenditures, and that we say it directly.

So. I am really just outlining the intention of Congress and really outlining the intent of what Mr. Bell says on page 20 when he says:

Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development.

When it is capital development, Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that it should then be on a loan basis.

If this is the specific legislative intent as you state, then I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield further to my good friend and chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. During the hearings it was definitely and specifically stated on three occasions by Mr. Sternfeld, the witness, that this aid to the Dominican Republic would be on a loan basis.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. That makes the legislative intent complete

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended by striking out "\$50,000,000" and substituting "\$150,000,000".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania: On page 2, line 3, strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will note that by the bill there is added \$100 million as an addition to the President's contingency fund for the current year, that is, the fiscal year expiring on June 30. There are 3 months remaining after the enactment of this bill authorizing this money. So such authorization for the President's contingency fund will be at a rate, if we calculate it annually, of \$400 million, because this present \$100 million increase is only for 90 days. Therefore we are increasing the President's contingency fund at a rate of \$400 million a year. This is too much undesignated funds by blanket authorization of Congress.

That is too much of a rate of expenditure, without designation or request by the President for Congress approval; my amendment would say to the President, "We will give you \$50 million more in the current fiscal year to spend until June 30, in addition to the \$54 million you already have in your contingency fund."

Mr. Chairman, the President right now has a contingency fund of \$54.1 million; \$4.1 million is the carryover from fiscal year 1965; \$50 million is authorized and allocated already in the 1966 fiscal year in which we are now operating, and which expires on June 30. That has been allocated, I might say, but not obligated. That means it has only been tentatively programed, and can be changed by a bookkeeping entry, alone.

Now, the question comes up: Will Congress increase the contingency fund by \$100 million more? My answer to that question is this: "Mr. President, I think if we give you a contingency fund whereby you can spend \$50 million in the next 90 days after you get this money, until June 30, 1966, that is a very good rate, because it is equivalent to giving you \$200 million for your fund for a year." That is quite a rate of spending by one Government source, without designation or authorization by Congress.

In the 1965 fiscal year the appropriation for the contingency fund was \$99.2 million, and the amount obligated or used was only \$57.2 million. In this fiscal year the authorization is \$50 million and the amount appropriated is \$50 million. But I do believe if the President has contingency funds to the extent that he will have \$100 million that is not obligated between now and June 30 in his special contingency fund to spend as he wants, that is sufficient.

You might say, was this contingency fund in any respect for the military? No; no part of it is for the military.

Second, is any part of it designated? No: no part of it is designated.

Third, are there enough funds for southeast Asia? Yes; the amount presently programed by this bill is \$415 million, of which \$350 million is for southeast Asia, and only \$25 million for the Dominican Republic. We must remember also that this Congress gave the President an extra and special contingency fund of \$89 million specifically for southeast Asia last year for use until the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1966.

So what Congress will be doing is this. My amendment will be adding \$50 million more to the President's present contingency fund of \$54.1 million. So he will have in his pocket, unspent as of this time, to spend between now and June 30, 1966, \$104.1 million. I think if there develops anywhere in the world, a new, unforeseen, and a bigger emergency than that, the administration should come back to the Congress with a specific request for authorization and then Congress would promptly give them the money. My point is that Congress should be consulted.

This contingency fund can be used any place. So if the Congress wants to keep

its authority and wants to keep its hand on the till and wants to be told what these emergencies and contingencies are, then I think we have to make the administration come back here for authorization and study of policies by the committees of Congress who have jurisdic-

So I recommend that my amendment be adopted giving the President \$50 million for his contingency fund for the 90 days after enactment, to June 30, 1966. My amendment carries the figure of \$100 million because there is \$50 million there now and I increase it \$50 million more so it makes it \$100 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Ful-

TON | has expired.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute amendment and if the gentleman from New Jersey will yield so that I may offer my substitute amendment, he can then speak to both amendments.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the floor.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On the first page, strike out line 10 and all that follows down through line 3 on page 2.

And renumber the following section ac-

cordingly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about this. I try always to offer amendments that are easily understood.

This amendment would simply strike out anything for the contingency fund. I offer the amendment for the reason, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said in part, that there was \$50 million for the contingency fund in the regular appropriation bill for this year but not one dime was expended in Vietnam. This bill deals with Vietnam. Moreover, under the terms of this bill the contingency fund, if you vote \$100 million more, can be spent anywhere in the world for anything at any time and at any place. There is nothing in this bill that would prohibit it. It can be used to pay the accounts of the deadbeats in the United Nations, for instance. Why I can think of 100 similar examples of how the money could be used. There is no limit.

There is no reason in the world why we should vote \$100 million to beef up the contingency fund for a period of only 120 days, or until the end of the fiscal

How foolish could we possibly be, to vote a \$100 million contingency fund here today in view of the fact that only \$50 million was approved for this entire fiscal year and it was not necessary to spend a dime or a dollar of that amount in Vietnam.

Let reason prevail. I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of-

fered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from

Mr. Chairman, the reason no money was expended on Vietnam under the contingency this year was that we had a special contingency fund provided under section 451 of \$89 million specifically obligated for Vietnam last year. That has all been used and all of it has been used in Vietnam. The additional \$54 million which was in the contingency fund has already been programed. There is no money remaining in that fund whatsoever.

If we adopt this amendment, it would be the first time a President of the United States did not have a contingency fund.

In 1956 we had a \$100 million contingency fund.

In 1957 we had a \$100 million contingency fund.

In 1959 there was a \$200 million contingency fund.

In 1960 there was a \$155 million contingency fund.

In 1961 there was a \$250 million contingency fund.

In 1962 there was a \$300 million

contingency fund.

These were the authorizations. might say too that the Congress has language in the act now which states that if the President does not use the money for the purposes outlined or defined as a contingency, it must be returned to the Treasury.

In 1963 when the contingency fund was not completely used, \$127 million

was returned to the Treasury.

The fact of the matter is if we adopt this amendment, the President would be without any funds whatsoever to take care of any contingency that might arise in the Dominican Republic or in Vietnam or in any of the dozen flash points throughout the world. This would be the first time that the President of the United States would not be provided with a contingency fund by the Congress. I think that is not the intent of this body. We have never done it before to any President regardless of party, and I do not think we should start now. There is no money in the contingency fund now and I do think we owe it to the President and to ourselves to put this amount in the bill so that the President will have the money to provide for the security of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton].

The amendment was rejected. AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: Page 2. line 3. strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and by insert-

ing immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: Funds appropriated under this subsection after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in Vietnam'.'

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if this bill is for the purpose of taking care of Vietnam, then let us take care of Vietnam. Let us not have any shilly-shallying around here. Unless you limit this, the money can be used to pay the dues, as I have said before of the deadbeats in the United Nations. It could be used to underwrite, so far as I know, the million dollars that the U.N. is extracting from American taxpayers to support the Technical College in Havana which is training Communists to carry out subversion and guerrilla warfare in Latin America.

This contingency fund, I say to you again, is wide open to be used in any part of the world at any time. If you mean what you say and say what you mean, adopt this amendment and at least see that the money is used in Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This again is a limiting amendment which would tie the President's hands.

The definition of "contingency fund" since 1956, when Eisenhower was President, has limited the contingency fund to unforeseen emergencies. It has never been limited to any country any place in the world. The contingency fund has been available wherever the emergency occurred.

There has never been any limitation on the use of the contingency fundnever. If you are going to handcuff the President we might as well not even vote for this bill.

We are in a war. This money is needed. Let us trust our President with this money. Let us get ahead with our job so that the boys over there can go on with the job of winning this war.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I agree with everything that our Chairman has said. I would like to point out this situation. Suppose North Vietnam decided to send a division of troops into Thailand tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. We might then want some of this contingency fund in order to rush some reinforcement there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I shall give you another example of how the contingency fund today is being used, and that is to finance the boycott of Rhodesia. I cannot help but wonder if we put \$100 million into this fund, if the British decided to use military force in Rhodesia, whether the contingency fund would not be tapped either to finance them in that enterprise or to send American troops over there.

Mr. MORGAN. I have not investigated the situation of Rhodesia. This measure has nothing to do with Rhodesia. The contingency fund might be used to help the neighbors around Rhodesia, but it has nothing to do with the boycott of Rhodesia.

Mr. GROSS. It could be used to support the British in their boycott of Rho-

desia.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentle-

man from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. In addition to what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] pointed out, if there was no money in this contingency fund, we would not have it available to support troops if we had to send them into Thailand.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question has come up as to whether at any time the contingency fund was specifically designated. I would point out that last year in chapter 5, contingency fund, section 451, the following statement appears:

In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in southeast Asia such sums not to exceed \$89 million as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized for parts I and II of this act.

So there has been a designation of a contingency fund by section on the \$89 million bill we passed last year. So why the objection this year?

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly the section I read to the gentleman when

I opposed his amendment.

That was an additional sum. If he wants to earmark an additional sum for Vietnam, let us do it. All of that has been explained.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That

is not the point.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I read that to the gentleman before. This was an additional amount.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The Chairman had said that there was no

special designation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to read it again. I have read it twice already. But if the gentleman wants to earmark a sum for Vietnam, let us do it, but let us not limit the President's authority to meet emergencies in other parts of the world.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite num-

ber of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not participated in this debate, and in the pleasant climate of unanimity that seemed to prevail it had been my intention to remain silent, contenting myself with voting for the bill after the shouting was over.

But when my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, brought Rhodesia into the framework of the discussion, implying that there was something evil in our insistence upon equality among the people of that unhappy country, I could not in good conscience, continue to maintain my silence. Virtue, Mr. Chairman, is not something that is up for barter. Morality is not among the wares in the mar-

ketplace. Our position as regards Rhodesia is based upon our national morality and our sense of virtue, and it is certainly not a stance we have taken to please England or anyone else. It is the position that conforms to the still voice of conscience within our own people.

Our virtues and our moralities do not change with the scenery of different parts of the world. What we stand for, and fight for, and for which we give to the utmost in Vietnam, is that for which we stand and fight and give in Rhodesia.

It is the right of self-determination of peoples everywhere, their right themselves to determine by the will of the majority the kind of government under which they will live and the kind of lives they will make for themselves and their children.

I cannot make it too clear that the issue in Rhodesia is essentially the same as the issue in Vietnam. The brutal fact is that in Rhodesia the great majority of the men, women and children, the Africans by race and ancestry, are not permitted the right of suffrage and are denied equality of opportunity. That is a condition we as Americans cannot condone. It has no part in the world of freedom to which we belong and for which we are risking so much in Vietnam and elsewhere.

We are happy that the Government of Great Britain is similarly minded as to Rhodesia, and the right of the majority of the people of that country to control their own destiny. But we are not beholden to Britain, nor Britain to the United States, because our two countries think alike and act with similar response when the virtues and the moralities are in issue.

The United States stands for the right of self-determination in Vietnam and in Rhodesia, and all the world around.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. I give back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAMBERLAIN

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Chamberlain: Page 2, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: No part of the funds appropriated under the preceding sentence after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be used to provide assistance to any country which permits any ship or aircraft under its registry to transport any equipment, materials, or commodities to or from North Vietnam unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered is one which eliminates a glaring loophole in existing legislation. It is my hope that Members of both sides of the aisle will join me in this effort to make clear, beyond doubt, the intent of the Congress to use the economic power of our Nation

in support of the servicemen whom the Nation has sent to the south Asian theater.

This amendment is comprehensive in scope. It denies assistance from the United States to any nation that permits its vessels or aircraft to transport any goods of any kind to North Vietnam. It means simply that the U.S. taxpayer will not be providing support to any nation that is involved in the business of transporting goods to our enemies in this bitter struggle.

Under existing law, foreign aid provided by our taxpayers is withheld from nations whose ships transport strategic goods or items of economic assistance to North Vietnam. The present law is thus restricted to certain types of commodities. It does not prohibit the grant of assistance by the United States to a nation whose ships transport to North Vietnam nonstrategic articles which are sold on ordinary commercial terms.

I think it important that the intent of Congress be made clear by the adoption of this amendment. By its adoption the Congress issues a warning to the other nations of the world that they can expect no further help from the United States unless they cease carrying goods to North Vietnam.

The amendment which I am offering leaves an escape hatch for the President if he cares to use it. The amendment, following the provisions of existing legislation permits the President to waive its prohibition if he determines that withholding of assistance to any country affected by the amendment would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress. To avoid controversy at this time on the question of the latitude which the President should enjoy in the conduct of foreign relations, and after discussions with the distinguished chairman, I include this clause in the text of the amendment.

I recognize that attaching this amendment to this particular bill is in a sense a symbolic act since this measure provides assistance to only a few nations. None of the nations specified in the bill would, to my knowledge, be affected by the prohibition contained in my amendment. The measure, however, does provide a contingency fund, and my amendment could operate to prevent the grant of aid to some nations from this fund. Though the adoption of this amendment may be symbolic, it is important. It is important above all for the Congress to let Americans who are fighting in Vietnam know that they are supported by the full economic power of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely essential that we make the whole world aware of this country's unrelenting determination to bring an end to free world trade with Hanoi. The most recent report of the State Department, all but claiming elimination of this trade, is unfortunately premature. During last month, for instance, the unclassified report I received from the Department of Defense acknowledges that there were seven free world vessels in North Vietnam. But let no one take comfort in this figure for the truth is more than double that. We are,

it would appear, returning to the level of traffic that existed 6 months ago.

We, especially here in Congress, must not let a single opportunity pass that offers the prospect of creating a roadblock for those who would profiteer while others die to safeguard freedom.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks

at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, because H.R. 12169 is described as a supplemental foreign assistance authorization, it is most necessary for some of us who have over the years opposed foreign aid to express our views on this bill for the record.

If this were just another broad program of foreign aid I would have no recourse but to oppose such an authorization. The question must be put bluntly, Is this only another worldwide foreign aid program? The report accompanying this bill written by the chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs makes it very clear and plain that what is involved here are additional funds primarily for Vietnam, closely related to our war effort there.

As we read the provisions of the bill itself it becomes apparent that to reach the objective stated in the report it must be amended to certain sections of the 1961 act. For the reason that there are no limitations spelled out in the bill earmarking these funds for Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand it would seem that the purpose contained in the report should be included with equal particularity in the bill itself. It is for such reason that I have supported the amendment which circumscribes the great bulk of these funds for Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand and I am hopeful that through some parliamentary procedure, perhaps by a motion to recommit, there may be a record vote that would leave no doubt that these funds are not simply more foreign aid funds but instead special purpose funding for use in the war in southeast Asia.

This morning it was my privilege as a member of the House Armed Services Committee to hear a report from Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY who had returned only last evening from an extended trip to Vietnam, Australia, India, and the Philippines. The Vice President emphasized that the recent Honoluly conference was a turning point there a determination was because reached that we should not only continue to wage the military struggle against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese but at Honolulu we committed ourselves to carry on another war against misery, hunger, illiteracy, erty, and disease throughout South Vietnam. I came away from this briefing convinced that we have an aggravated problem to deal with in South Vietnam that ranks almost equal in importance to our military effort to stop the Communist aggression.

The funds authorized by this bill are for such worthwhile projects as port expansion, refugee relief, and rural recon-

struction. Who can say these activities are anything but just another face of the war. Along with many others I have opposed foreign aid consistently and repeatedly over the past several years. It is my intention to oppose indiscriminate handouts in the future. It should be clear enough that there is a sharp difference between peacetime economic assistance to the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, on the one hand and special wartime help to Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

One of the differences which immediately rises to the surface of any discussion is the fact that frequently in the past we have left behind a package of aid without adequate administrative personnel to direct or maintain an oversight of its use. On the contrary, in Vietnam and the neighboring countries of Laos and Thailand this present aid will be completely geared or meshed to the military effort. Much of the opposition to foreign aid in so many parts of the world has been based on its maladministration, for many long years. Opposition has been outspoken because military assistance has been contained in the same package with economic aid. It has never made very good sense to me for military assistance to be administered by the State Department rather than by qualified, experienced military personnel. It was good news to learn the President has recommended that in the future no military operations be financed by the Foreign Assistance Act. Notwithstanding this pronouncement for the future, it seems to me we have some good assurance because of the presence of our topflight military commanders in southeast Asia that this special or particular allocation of foreign assistance will in fact be just as much military assistance as if so titled or labeled.

We must remind ourselves anew that it is the presence of our military forces that have created some of the problems of the Vietnamese people. Their government is completely helpless to expand its revenues by taxation, yet they are faced with vital work of repairing war damage to their bridges and highways. They have a huge refugee bill that must be met.

Equally as important as the repair of damage is the counterinsurgency measures such as restoring of farms, and combating disease, in order that the rural population may be given a renewed will to carry on their resistance against the Vietcong.

In Laos there are areas that are now being contested by the Communists and some must be supplied by air. In portions of northeast Thailand the civilian population is being subjected to virtually the same terrorist tactics of murder and assassination as in South Vietnam. Who can argue that funds to strengthen the police units patrolling these besieged northeast Thailand communities is anything but a military effort?

In a word, under the circumstances of the present moment the real justification for H.R. 12169 is embodied in the proposition that if we don't send this \$275 million to Vietnam and the additional \$15 million to Laos and Thailand, then

the remaining alternative is that we are going to have to send more American troops. The choice between our alternatives is made easy.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to say that I have followed the gentleman's work on this amendment since early last year. I know he has devoted a great deal of time and study to the ships going to North Vietnam. I have read with interest the last several insertions and speeches he has put in the Record on this subject.

I have examined the amendment very carefully, and it conforms with the so-called Castro-Cuban amendment. I think it is a good amendment and, speaking for the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we will accept it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Chamberlain].

The amendment was agreed to.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Funds made available pursuant to section 1 of this Act shall be available for transfer for expenses authorized by section 637(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and incurred in connection with programs in the Republic of Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 610(b) of such Act, which relates to transfer between accounts, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Not to exceed \$1,400,000 of the funds appropriated under section 402 of this Act after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, may be transferred to and consolidated with appropriations made under section 637 (a) of this Act for such fiscal year, subject to the limitations of subsection (a) of this section and subject to the further limitation that funds so transferred shall be available solely for administrative expenses incurred in connection with programs in the Republic of Vietnam."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Thompson of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 742, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put then en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DERWINSKI moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 12169) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

"(c) Immediately after the first sentence insert the following: 'Funds appropriated under this section after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in the following countries and within the following dollar limitations: Not to exceed \$275.000.000 shall be available solely for use in Vietnam, not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Laos, not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available solely use in Thailand, and not to exceed \$25,000,000 shall be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were-yeas 169, nays 213, not voting 50. as follows:

[Roll No. 231 YEAS-169

Abbitt Abernethy Cramer Johnson, Pa. Cunningham Jonas Jones, Mo. Adair Curtin Anderson, Ill. Curtis Jones, N.C. Davis, Ga. Davis, Wis. Derwinski Devine Andrews, George W. Keith Kunkel Andrews Laird Langen Andrews, N. Dak. Dickinson Latta Dole Lennon Downing Dulski Arends Lipscomb Ashmore Long. La. Duncan, Tenn. Ayres Baring McCulloch Dwyer Edwards, Ala. Ellsworth Bates Battin McDade McEwen Belcher Erlenborn McMillan Bennett Everett MacGregor Marsh Martin, Ala. Martin, Mass. Martin, Nebr. Berry Betts Findley Fino Ford, Gerald R. Bolton Fulton, Pa. Bow Bray Brock May Michel Fuqua Gettys Broomfield Brown, Ohio Broyhill, N.C. Broyhill, Va. Goodell Minshall Gross Mize Gurney Moeller Hagen, Calif. Moore Haley Buchanan Morton Burton, Utah Byrnes, Wis. Callaway Hall Mosher Hansen, Idaho Murray Harsha Henderson Nelsen Carter Chamberlain O'Konski O'Neal, Ga. Herlong Horton Passman Clancy Clawson, Del Cleveland Collier Pelly Hosmer Hull Pike Hutchinson Pirnie Colmer Ichord Jarman Poff Pool Conte Corbett Jennings Johnson, Okla. Quie Quillen

Randall Reid, Ill. Reifel Reinecke Rhodes, Ariz. Roberts Robison Rogers, Fla. Rogers, Tex. Rumsfeld Satterfield Schneebeli Schweiker Secrest Shipley Shriver

Adams

Albert

Anderson.

Tenn.

Ashley Aspinall

Barrett

Bell

Beckworth

Bingham

Brademas

Blatnik

Boggs Boland

Brooks

Burke

Cahill

Callan

Carey

Celler

Clark

Cameron

Clevenger

Conyers

Corman

Daddario

de la Garza

Daniels

Delaney

Denton

Diggs Dingell

Donohue

Dent

Dow

Fallon

Farbstein

Farnum

Feighan

Fascell

Flood

Flynt

Foley

Ford

Fogarty

Fountain

Gallagher

Garmatz

Gathings

Giaimo

Gibbons Gilbert

Gilligan

Ashbrook

Baldwin

Bandstra

Burleson

Casey Cederberg

Bolling

Chelf

Clausen

Dague

Dawson

Don H. Cohelan

Fraser

Friedel

William D.

Frelinghuysen

Fulton, Tenn.

Cooley

Craley Culver

Smith, Calif. Smith, N.Y. Smith, Va. Springer Stafford Stanton Stephens Taylor Teague, Calif. Thomson, Wis Tuck Utt Waggonner NAYS-213 Gonzalez Grabowski Addabbo

Sikes

Skubitz

Gray Green, Oreg. Green, Pa. Greigg Griffin Griffiths Grover Halpern Hamilton Hanley Hanna Hardy Harvey, Mich, Hathaway Hawkins Brown, Calif. Hays Hechler Burton, Calif. Byrne, Pa. Cabell Helstoski Hicks Holifield Holland Hungate Irwin Jacobs Joelson Johnson, Calif. Jones, Ala. Karsten Karth Kastenmeier Kelly Keogh King, Calif. King, Utah Kirwan Kluczynski Krebs Kupferman Leggett Long, Md. Duncan Oreg. Love McCarthy Edmondson Edwards, Calif. Evans, Colo. Evins, Tenn. McDowell McFall McGrath McVicker Macdonald Machen Mackie Madden Mahon Mailliard Mathias Matsunaga Meeds Mills Minish

NOT VOTING-

Murphy, Ill Murphy, N.Y. Natcher

Mink

Monagan

Morgan Morris

Morse

Moss

Nedzi

Morrison

-50 Hébert Dorn Dowdy King, N.Y. Dyal Edwards, La. Kornegay Landrum Farnsley Mackay Matthews Fisher Grider Gubser Hagan, Ga. Halleck Miller Moorhead Hansen, Iowa Hansen, Wash Harvey, Ind. Roudebush

Walker, Miss. Walker, N. Mex. Watkins Watson Whalley Whitener Whitten Widnall Williams Wilson, Bob Wolff Wyatt Wydler Younger

Nix O'Brien O'Hara, Ill. O'Hara, Mich. Olsen, Mont. Olson, Minn. O'Neill, Mass Ottinger Patman Pepper Perkins Philbin

Patten Pickle Poage Powell Price Pucinski Purcell Race Redlin Reid, N.Y. Resnick Reuss Rhodes, Pa. Rivers, Alaska Rodino Rogers, Colo. Ronan Roncalio Rooney, N.Y. Rooney, Pa. Rosenthal Roush Roybal Ryan St Germain St. Onge Scheuer Schisler Schmidhauser Sickles Sisk Slack Stalhaum Steed Stratton Stubblefield Sullivan Sweeney Tenzer Thompson, N.J. Thompson, Tex. Trimble Tunney Tupper

Tuten

Ullman

Vivian

Yates

Young

Weltner

Van Deerlin

White, Tex. Wright

Udall

Multer Rivers, S.C. Rostenkowski

Toll Vigorito Wilson, Charles H. Scott Sanner Watts Zablocki Smith, Iowa White, Idaho Teague, Tex. Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Senner against. Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against

Mr Scott for, with Mr. Grider against. Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Zablocki against. Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Cohelan against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Hansen of Iowa against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Toll against. Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Mackay

Mr. Hagan of Georgia for, with Mr. Miller against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Multer with Mr. Dague. Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Baldwin. Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Ashbrook. Mr. Matthews with Mr. Halleck. Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Gubser. Mr. Casey with Mr. Smith of Iowa Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Watts. Mr. Dorn with Mr. Farnsley. Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Rivers

of South Carolina

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kee. Mr. Chelf with Mr. Willis. Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Dyal.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 350, nays 27, answer "present" 3, not voting 52, as follows: answered

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS-350 Abernethy Bray Brock Daddario Adair Daniels Davis, Wis. de la Garza Delaney Adams Brooks Broomfield Addabbo Brown, Ohio Broyhill, N.C. Broyhill, Va. Albert Anderson, Ill. Dent Denton Anderson, Tenn. Buchanan Devine Andrews Burke Burton, Calif. Burton, Utah Byrne, Pa. Dingell George W. Dole Donohue Andrews, Dow Downing Dulski Glenn Andrews, N. Dak Byrnes, Wis. Cabell Duncan, Oreg. Duncan, Tenn. Annunzio Cahill Arends Callan Ashley Callaway Dwyer Edmondson Aspinall Cameron Celler Chamberlain Edwards, Ala. Edwards, Calif. Ayres Baring Ellsworth Erlenborn Barrett Clancy Bates Clawson, Del Cleveland Evans, Colo. Everett Battin Beckworth Evins, Tenn. Belcher Clevenger Bell Collier Fallon Bennett Conable Conte Farbstein Berry Betts Bingham Farnum Cooley Fascell Feighan Blatnik Corman Findley Boggs Boland Bolton Craley Fino Flood Flynt Cramer Culver Cunningham Bow Fogarty Brademas

Ford, Gerald R. Long, La. Ford, Long, Md. Ford, William D. Love McCarthy Fountain McClory McCulloch Fraser Frelinghuysen Friedel McDade Fulton, Pa. Fulton, Tenn. Gallagher McDowell McEwen McGrath Garmatz McMillan McVicker Gathings Gettys Macdonald Gibbons MacGregor Gilbert Machen Gilligan Gonzalez Mackie Madden Goodell Mahon Grabowski Mailliard Gray Marsh Martin, Ala. Martin, Mass. Green, Oreg. Green, Pa. Greigg Griffin Martin, Nebr. Mathias Griffiths Matsunaga May Meeds Michel Grover Hagen, Calif. Halpern Hamilton Mills Minish Hanley Mink Minshall Hanna Hansen, Idaho Hardy Moeller Monagan Harsha Harvey, Mich. Moore Morgan Hathaway Hawkins Morris Havs Morrison Hechler Helstoski Morton Henderson Mosher Herlong Moss Multer Murphy, Ill. Murphy, N.Y. Holifield Holland Horton Murray Hosmer Natcher Howard Nedzi Hull Nelsen Hungate Nix O'Brien O'Hara, Ill. O'Hara, Mich. Hutchinson Irwin O'Konski Jacobs Olsen, Mont. Olson, Minn. Jarman Jennings Joelson O'Neill, Mass. Johnson, Calif. Johnson, Okla. Johnson, Pa. Ottinger Patman Patten Jonas Pelly Jones, Ala. Jones, Mo. Jones, N.C. Pepper Perkins Philbin Karsten Pike Karth Kastenmeier Keith Pirnie Poage Kelly Keogh Price King, Calif. King, Utah Pucinski Purcell Kirwan Kluczynski Quie Quillen Krebs Kunkel Race Randall Kupferman Redlin Laird Rees Reid, Ill. Latta Reid, N.Y. Leggett Reifel

NAYS-27

Reinecke

Lipscomb

Abbitt Gurney Satterfield Ashmore Haley Shipley Smith, Va. Brown, Calif. Hall Curtis Ichord Stephens Davis, Ga. Derwinski Dickinson Tuck Walker, Miss. Walker, N. Mex. Lennon O'Neal, Ga. Passman Fuqua Pool Rogers, Tex. Williams Gross

ANSWERED "PRESENT"-3

Conyers Diggs Powell
NOT VOTING-52

Ashbrook Carter Cohelan
Baldwin Casey Colmer
Bandstra Cederberg Dague
Bolling Chelf Dawson
Burleson Clausen, Dorn
Carey Don H. Dowdy

Dyal Edwards, La. Farnsley King, N.Y. Kornegay Senner Smith, Iowa Fisher Landrum Teague, Tex. Toll Vigorito Grider Mackay Gubser Matthews Hagan, Ga. Miller White, Idaho Halleck Mize Hansen, Iowa Hansen, Wash. Harvey, Ind. Hébert Moorhead Willis Rostenkowski Roudebush Wilson. Charles H. Zablocki Saylor

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Resnick Reuss Rhodes, Ariz.

Roberts

Robison

Rodino

Ronan Roncalio

Roush

Rhodes, Pa. Rivers, Alaska Rivers, S.C.

Rogers, Colo.

Rooney, N.Y.

Rosenthal

Roybal Rumsfeld

St. Onge

Scheuer

Schisler

Selden

Shriver

Sickles

Skubitz

Springer

Stafford

Staggers

Stanton

Stratton

Sullivan

Sweeney

Tenzer

Todd

Trimble

Tunney

Tupper

Tuten Udall

Ullman

Vanik

Vivian

Watson Weltner

Van Deerlin

Waggonner

Whalley White, Tex.

Wilson, Bob

Whitener

Whitten

Widnall

Wolff

Wright

Wvatt

Wydler Yates

Young

Younger

Stubblefield

Taylor Teague, Calif.

Thompson, N.J.

Thompson, Tex. Thomson, Wis.

Steed

Stalbaum

Smith, Calif.

Smith N.Y.

Sikes

Slack

Sisk

St Germain

Schneebeli Schweiker

Schmidhauser

Rogers, Fla.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Fisher against. Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Dowdy against. Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Dyal for, with Mr. Colmer against. Mr. Cederberg for, with Mrs. Roudebush against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Saylor against.
Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Harvey of

Indiana against.

Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Baldwin. Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Halleck. Mr. Mackay with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Gubser. Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Dague. Mr. Watts with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Teague of Texas. Mr. Toll with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Casey. Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Matthews. Mr. Grider with Mrs. Hansen of Washing-

ton.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Vigorito.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. ABERNETHY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced

as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I destre to call the attention of the Members of the House to the address by the President of the United States last night on the occasion of receiving the National Freedom Award in New York City. The President delivered one of his greatest speeches, a speech which manifested not only strength but also the resolution of the President of the United States, which is shared by this House and by the people of this country, to the cause of human freedom.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the majority leader for calling to the attention of the House the magnificent address made by the President of the United States last evening in New York. It spells out with great clarity why we are in Vietnam and what our objectives are.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to commend the Members of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle for the responsible attitude that they have taken as Americans and not as Republicans or Democrats in supporting our Nation's determination to resist naked Communist ag-

gression in southeast Asia.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman from Louisiana has said, and I associate myself with his remarks. I do not know whether it is as well known as it should be around the country, but I can assert with complete confidence that the House of Representatives and its Members in overwhelming numbers support the policy of the United States in South Vietnam. We have whatever will, whatever determination is required to see the job through to a victorious conclusion. We will not falter. We will not fail.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert with my remarks the text of the President's message in the body of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 24, 1966]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S REMARKS AT THE FREEDOM AWARDS

Twenty-five years ago—to a world darkened by war—President Franklin Roosevelt described the Four Freedoms of mankind: Freedom of speech and expression.

Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way.

Freedom from want. Freedom from fear.

Franklin Roosevelt knew that these freedoms could not be the province of one people alone. He called on his countrymen to assist those who endured the tyrant's bombs and suffered his oppression.

He called for courage—for generosity—for resolution in the face of terror. He said that:

"Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights—or keep them."

Wendell Willkie—Franklin Roosevelt's opponent in the campaign of 1940—shared his belief that freedom could not be founded only on American shores or only for those whose skin is white. "Freedom is an indivisible word," he said. "If we want to enjoy it, and fight for it, we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin."

That was Republican policy 25 years ago. It was Democratic policy 25 years ago. It is American policy tonight.

How well have we done in our time in making the four freedoms real for our people, and for the people of the world?

Here in America we accord every man the right to worship as he wills. I believe we are more tolerant of religious or sectional differences than we were a quarter of a century ago. The majority of our people believe that a qualified man or woman—of any race—any religion—any section—could hold any office in the land. This was not so clear in 1940.

We are committed, now-however great the trial and tension-to protecting the right of free expression and peaceful dissent. have learned to despise the witch hunt-the unprincipled harassment of a man's integrity and his right to be different. We have gained in tolerance—and I am determined to use the high office I hold to protect and encourage that tolerance.

I do not mean to say that I will remain altogether silent on the critical issues of our day. For just as strongly as I believe in other men's freedom to disagree, so do I believe in the President's freedom to persuade. Let me assure you that I will do everything in my power to defend both.

AMERICAN RECORD

Twenty-five years ago "freedom from want" had the ring of urgency for our people. The unemployment rate stood at 14½ percent. Millions of Americans had spent the last decade in the breadlines or on farms where the winds howled away any chance for a

Tonight there are still millions whose poverty haunts our conscience. There are still fathers without jobs and children without hope.

Yet for the vast majority of Americans, these are times when the hand of plenty has replaced the grip of want. For the first time in almost 9 years, the unemployment rate has fallen to 4 percent.

This liberation from want-for which we thank God-is a testimony to the enduring vitality of our competitive economy.

It is a testimony also to an enlightened public policy, established by Franklin Roosevelt and strengthened by every administration since his death.

That policy has freed Americans for more hopeful, more productive lives.

It has relieved their fears of growing oldby social security and medicare.

It has inspired them with hope for their children-by aid to elementary and higher education.

It has helped to create economic opportunity-by enlightened fiscal policies.

It has granted to millions, born into hopeless deprivation, the chance of a new start in life-by public works, private incentive, and poverty programs.

For the Negro American, it has opened the door—after centuries of enslavement and discrimination—to the blessings America offers to those willing and able to earn them.

Thus we address the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, 25 years after his message to America and the world, with confidence and with an unflagging determination. We have served his vision of the four freedoms essential to mankind-here in America.

DENIED ELSEWHERE

Yet we know he did not speak only for America. We know that the four freedoms are not secure in America when they are violently denied elsewhere in the world.

We know, too, that it requires more than speeches to resist the international enemies of freedom. We know that men respond to deeds when they are deaf to words. Even the precious word "freedom" may become empty to those without the means to use it.

For what does freedom mean when famine chokes the land; when new millions crowd upon already strained resources; when narrow privilege is entrenched behind law and custom; when all conspires to teach men that they cannot change the conditions of their lives?

I do not need to tell you how five administrations have labored to give real meaning to "freedom"—in a world where it is often merely a phrase that conceals oppression and neglect.

Men in this room-men throughout America-have given their skills and treasure to You have warned our people how insatiable is aggression-and how it thrives on human misery.

You have carried the word-that without the sense that they can change the conditions of their lives, nothing can avail the oppressed of this earth-neither good will. nor national sovereignty, nor massive grants of aid from their more fortunate brothers.

You have known, too, that men who be-lieve they can change their destinies will change them.

Armed with that belief, they will be will--yes, eager-to make the sacrifices that freedom demands. They will be anxious to shoulder the responsibilities that are inseparably bound to freedom.

They will be able to look beyond the four

essential freedoms:
To the freedom to learn, to master new skills, to acquaint themselves with the lore of man and nature

To the freedom to grow, to become the best that is within them to become, to cast off the voke of discrimination and disease.

To the freedom to hope, and to build on that hope, lives of integrity and well-being.

This is what our struggle in Vietnam is about. This is what our struggle for equal rights in this country is about.

We seek to create that climate—at home and abroad-where unlettered men can learn, where deprived children can grow, where hopeless millions can be inspired to change the terms of their existence for the better.

THREAT OF TERROR

That climate cannot be created where terror fills the air.

Children cannot learn-men cannot earn their bread—women cannot heal the sick—where the night of violence has blotted out the sun.

Whether in the cities and hamlets of Vietnam, or in the ghettoes of our own cities, the struggle is the same. It is to end the violence against the human mind and body-so that the work of peace may be done, and the fruits of freedom won.

We are pitting the resources of the lawof education and training-of our vision and our compassion-against that violence here at home. And we shall end it-in our time.

On the other side of the earth, we are no less committed to ending violence against men who are struggling to be free.

It is about that commitment that I wish to speak now.

Tonight, in Vietnam, more than 200,000 young Americans fight for freedom. Tonight our people are determined that these men shall have whatever help they need and that their cause-which is our cause-shall be sustained

But in these last days there have been questions about what we are doing in Vietnam, and these questions have been answered loudly and clearly for every citizen to see and hear. The strength of America can never be sapped by discussion-and we have no better or stronger tradition than open debate in hours of danger. We believe, with Macaulay, that men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss

We are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

What are the questions that are still being asked?

First, some ask if this is a war for unlimited objectives. The answer is plain: It is "No." Our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the success of aggression. not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination.

It is to prevent the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

Second, some ask if we are caught in a blind escalation of force that is pulling us headlong toward a wider war that no one The answer-again-is "No." wants. are using that force-and only that force necessary to stop the aggression. Our fighting men are in Vietnam because tens of thousands of invaders came south before them. Our numbers have increased-because the aggression of others has increased. The high hopes of the aggressor have been dimmed, and the tide of the battle has turned. Our measured use of force must be continued. But this is prudent firmness under careful control. There is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation.

Third, others ask if our fighting men are to be denied the help they need. The answer is again, and will be, a resounding "No." Our great Military Establishment has moved 200,000 men across 10,000 miles since last spring. spring.

These men have, and will have, what they need to fight the aggressor. They have already performed miracles in combat. men behind them have worked miracles of supply—building new ports, transporting new equipment, opening new roads.

The American forces of freedom are strong today in South Vietnam. And we will keep them so. They are led by a brilliant and resourceful commander—Gen. William Westmoreland. He knows the needs of war and he supports the works of peace. When he asks for more Americans to help the men he has, his requests will be immediately studied, and, as I promised last July, his needs will be met.

Fourth, some ask if our men go alone to Vietnam-if we alone respect our great commitment in the southeast Asia treaty. Still again the answer is "No." We have seven allies in SEATO and five of them are giving vital support, each with his own strength and in his own way, to the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

Fifth, some ask about the risk of wider war-perhaps against the vast land armies of Red China. And again the answer is "No," never by any act of ours—and not if there is any reason left behind the wild words from Peiping.

We have threatened no one-and we will not

We seek the end of no regime-and we will not.

Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack, we will re-We have measured the strength-and the weakness—of others, and we know our own. We observe in ourselves—and we applaud in others—a careful restraint in ac-tion. We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched by caution in deed.

Sixth, men ask if we rely on guns alone. Still again the answer is "No." From our Honolulu meeting, from the clear pledge which joins us with our allies in Saigon, there has emerged a common dedication to the peaceful progress of the people of Vietnam-to schools for their children, to care for their health, to hope and bounty for their land.

The Vice President returned today from his constructive and highly successful visit to Saigon and other capitals, and he tells me that he and Ambassador Lodge have found a new conviction and purpose in South Vietnam-for the battle against want and injustice as well as the battle against aggression.

So the pledge of Honolulu will be kept, and the pledge of Baltimore stands open-to help the men of the North when they have the wisdom to be ready.

We Americans must understand how fundamental is the meaning of this second war-the war on want. I talked on my farm last fall with Secretary Freeman, and in my office last week with Secretary Gardnermaking, over and over again, the same central point: The breeding ground of war is human misery. If we are not to fight forever in faraway places—in Europe, or the far Pacific, or the jungles of Africa, or the suburbs of Santo Domingo, then we must learn to get at the roots of violence. As a nation we must magnify our struggle against world hunger and illiteracy and disease. We must bring hope to men whose lives now end at two score or less. Without that hope—without progress in this war on want—we will be called to fight again and again, as we must today.

Seventh, men ask who has a right to rule in South Vietnam. Our answer there is what it has been here for 200 years: people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people-and no one else. Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. We will insist for ourselves on what we require from Hanoi: respect for the principle of government by the consent of the governed. We stand for self-determination-for free elections-and we will

honor their result.

Eighth, men ask if we are neglecting any hopeful chance of peace. And the answer is "No." A great servant of peace, Secretary Rusk, has sent the message of peace on every wire and by every hand to every continent. A great pleader for peace, Arthur Goldberg, has worked at home and abroad in this same cause. Their undiscouraged efforts will continue. How much wiser it would have been, how much more compassionate toward its own people, if Hanoi had come to the bargaining table at the close of the year. Then the 7,000 Communist troops who have died in battle since January 1—and the many thousands who have been wounded in that same period-could have lived at peace with their fellow men. Today—as then—Hanoi has the opportunity to end the increasing toll the war is taking on those under its command.

Ninth. Some ask how long we must bear this burden. To that question-in all honesty-I can give no answer tonight. During the Battle of Britain, when that nation stood alone in 1940, Winston Churchill gave no answer to that question. When the forces of freedom were driven from the Philippines, President Roosevelt could not and did not name the date we would return. If the aggressor persists in Vietnam, the struggle may be long. Our men in battle know and accept this hard fact. We who are at home can do as much. There is no computer that can tell the hour and day of peace, but we do know that it will come only to the steadfastnever to the weak in heart.

Tenth. And finally, men ask if it is worth it. I think you know the answer. It is the answer that Americans have given for a quarter of a century, wherever American strength has been pledged to prevent aggres-The contest in Vietnam is confused and hard, and many of its forms are new. Yet our purpose and policy are unchanged.

Our men in Vietnam are there to keep a promise made 12 years ago. The Southeast Asia Treaty promised—as Secretary John Foster Dulles said for the United States— "that an attack upon the treaty area would occasion a reaction so united, so strong, and so well placed that the aggressor would lose more than it could hope to gain." But we keep more than a specific treaty promise in Vietnam. We keep the faith for freedom.

d Buly mind attended to

PRESIDENTS' PLEDGES

Four Presidents have pledged to keep that

The first was Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his state of the Union message 25 years ago. He

"We are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom."

The second was Harry S. Truman, in 1947, at a historic turning point in the history of guerrilla warfare—and of Greece and Turkey and the United States. These were

his words:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.
"I believe that we must assist free peoples

to work out their own destinies in their own way.

The third was Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his first inaugural address. He promised

"Realizing that commonsense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. Americans, indeed, all freemen, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

And then 5 years ago, John F. Kennedy, on the cold bright noon of his first day in

office, proclaimed:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans-born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

This is the American tradition. Built in free discussion, proven on a hundred battlefields, rewarded by a progress at home that has no match in history, it beckons us forward now to the work of peace in Vietnam.

We will build freedom while we fight, and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high hard road of freedom. We are too old to be foolhardy and too young to be tired—too strong for fear and too determined for retreat.

Each evening when I retire, I take up from a bedside table—reports from the battlefront and from the capitals of the world. They tell me how our men have fared that in the hills and valleys of Vietnam. They tell me what hope there seems to be that the message of peace will be heard, and this tragic war ended.

I read of individual acts of heroism-of dedicated men and women whose valor matches that of any generation that has gone before. I read of men risking their lives to save others—of men giving their lives for freedom.

Always among these reports are a few letters from the men themselves

If there is doubt among some here at home about our purposes in Vietnam, I do not find it reflected in these letters. Our soldiers. our marines, our airmen, our sailors, know why they are in Vietnam. They know—as five Presidents have known—how inseparably

bound together are America's freedom and the freedom of her friends in the world.

Tonight I ask each citizen to join mein the homes and meeting places our men are fighting to keep free from oppression-in a prayer for their safety.

I ask you to join me in a pledge to the cause for which they fight—the cause of

human freedom.

I ask you for your help—for your under-standing and your commitment—so that this united people may show forth to the world that America has not ended the only struggle worthy of man's unceasing sacrifice—the struggle to be free.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sponsor legislation that would make permanent the school milk program. This act may be cited as the Children's Special Milk Act.

I include myself among that large group of Members of this body who were shocked at the proposed slash of \$82 million in the school milk program.

In the President's budget message of January 24, we were told that "many older and lower priority activities" would have to be reduced or eliminated "in order to finance the costs of our efforts in southeast Asia."

It is obvious that a certain belttightening is in order as a result of our grave obligations in southeast Asia.

But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the health and nutrition of our Nation's youngsters, cannot and must not be a matter of lower priority in the wide ranging concerns of our National Government.

I do not intend to belabor my colleagues with a statistical-studded brief on the acceptance and growth of the school milk program, how much true good it has accomplished, and how vital it is to millions of schoolchildren.

However, an eloquent insight to the value of this program can be obtained from the following letter I received from B. T. Smith, administrator of a school district in northern Wisconsin.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Smith's letter at this point in my remarks:

> JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 1, Winter, Wis., February 17, 1966.

Hon. JOHN RACE, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RACE: Communications are coming in to me with regard to the possibility of cutting off a good percentage of the funds for Public Law 874, for National Defense Education Act, and for the school milk program. All these programs are of great concern to us here in northern Wisconsin-as I suspect they are in other communities where the income per family is very

Our school district for which we are directly concerned is made up largely from lowincome families. We have 30 or more children from families living on nontaxable lands. These families contribute nothing in helping to finance the cost of schools or their municipal governments. Yet their children need and deserve an educationand they need food. Some of these families have insufficient income to provide family necessities.

Much is being done in this, our country to combat poverty-but on the other hand, young people in our area have been denied work programs. To take away the aid from Public Law 874 means that others in our area will have to provide school lunches for the children of needy parents and they will also have to furnish them with teachers.

The programs I have mentioned above have helped us a great deal but to take them away will hurt not only the children of the areait will hurt all of us. Our school taxes are up to the limit now so cutting down on the programs, National Defense Education Act, Public Law 874, and the school milk program, will mean a definite problem for us.

If there is a desire to help people who have low incomes, or are impoverished, the proother antipoverty programs have not helped us in any way.

Our board of education met last evening and each member was much concerned about the possible legislation to cut the aids mentioned above.

I am sure that you, as Representative, will realize that these losses will affect your areas, too.

I hope that you can find it in your heart to move against any bill to cut these funds. My best regards to you.

B. T. SMITH. Administrator.

Yes. I do find it in my heart to move against any bill that would scuttle a program that has proved itself so valuable to children and their families in every State of our Nation.

I think I can say without contradiction that I represent a district which ranks as one of the top three of four districts in this country in milk production. We in the Sixth District of Wisconsin-a district that has more cows than people-are fully aware of the nutritional values of milk and dairy products.

For generation after generation the people of my district have been producing milk products for the Nation. The people of my district have contributed enormously to the health and vitality of all Americans, all too often at the expense of a full share of our national prosperity.

Thousands of Wisconsin dairy farmers have continued to serve the Nation's needs, hoping against hope it seems, that sooner or later the Nation would take them in as equal sharers in our prosperity.

Many thousands of others have been forced to abandon that hope and are now leaving their farms at alarming rates. Now, our National Government seems to be trying to kick them off the farms, at the very time it should be taking drastic measures to halt the bolt.

Has our Government grown so big, and so calloused, and so out-of-touch with reality that we have come to the incredible situation of having some budget bureaucrat, or even computer, sit in an office here in Washington and announce that hereafter little children no longer need milk? That the Nation no longer needs dairy farmers? That bullets and bombs for southeast Asia are more important than the health of our Nation's youngsters?

I pray that such a time and circumstance never occur in this country.

Yes, I represent thousands of dairy

But I also represent in this Congress of the United States the interests of my Nation and its people.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I serve notice that I will not and cannot go along with a budget bureaucrat's decision to strangle the school milk program.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my bill which would make the school milk program a permanent program, with a funding of \$110 million for fiscal 1957.

HR -

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Children's Special Milk Act"

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage the consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this Act "United States" means the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

SEC. 3. All sums appropriated under this Act, less such amounts as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable and necessary for his administrative costs and reserves, shall be allocated at the earliest possible date for the use of nonprofit schools and other nonprofit institutions desiring to participate in the program and shall be used to reimburse such nonprofit schools and other nonprofit institutions for fluid milk served to children. Any such allocation, or portion thereof, which the Secretary shall determine will not be fully utilized by any such nonprofit school or other nonprofit institution as then allocated, shall be reallocated by the Secretary so as to accomplish maximum use of such funds.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying out this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not less than \$110,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not less than \$115,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each succeeding fiscal year thereafter, not less than \$120,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, under unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, I submit certain communications I have received on the subject of the proposed curtailment of funds for the school milk program:

MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION, Washington, D.C., February 11, 1966. Hon. JOHN A. RACE,

House of Representatives.

Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RACE: We solicit your support for continuance of the special milk program which in fiscal year 1965 was used by 92,005 schools and child care institutions where 2,966,800,000 half pints of milk were consumed. By comparison, 70,132 schools participated in the national school lunch program and used 2,876,150,103 half pints of milk in fiscal 1965

This usage of milk aggregated nearly 3 billion pounds. Had this milk not been so

used, there can be little doubt that it would have been acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the form of nonfat dry milk, butter, and cheese, since approximately 5.7 billion pounds on a milk equivalent basis was actually acquired. The direct cost at the present support price would have been \$103 million, the exact amount Congress appropriated for the special milk program for fiscal 1966. In addition, there would have been the cost of acquiring, handling, packaging, and transporting the products which would have been made from the 3 billion pounds of milk used in the school lunch and school milk programs.

While commercial consumption has shown a gain during the past year and some further gain is expected this year, it now appears that an estimated 3 to 4 billion pounds of milk in the form of nonfat dry milk, butter and cheese will be acquired under the price support program in 1966.

In the light of these circumstances it makes extremely good sense to continue the special milk program. Nearly 22,000 more schools and child care institutions use this program than use the school lunch program. More children are benefited by having a nutritious energy-giving food in the form of

At a time when our Government is spending millions of dollars to rehabilitate school dropouts, is enlarging the food stamp program, and carrying on a war against poverty, it is inconsistent to curtail a program that adds to the health, energy, and vitality of children who are in school and thereby helps them to stay in school. This is especially true with respect to the 22,000 schools and institutions which, because of lack of facilities, funds, or for other reasons do not have a school lunch program.

We of the Milk Industry Foundation, a trade association of milk processors having members doing business in every State of the Nation, including of course your State, respectfully request your help in maintaining the special milk program at a level where all schools and child institutions wishing to

participate may do so.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. NORTH, Executive Director.

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICUL-TURAL COOPERATIVES Madison, Wis., February 11, 1966. Congressman John A. Race, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RACE: The Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives strongly protests the proposed unprecedented 1967 budget cut of \$82 million for the special milk program for schoolchildren. We urge that the special milk program budgets be restored to \$103 million, the current appropriation; preferably funds for this program should be authorized at \$115 million.

The proposed reduction of \$19 million in the school lunch program should also be restored by Congress.

A reduction of the size proposed is tantamount to complete elimination of the special milk program. Complete elimination would divert about 1.5 billion pounds of milk now consumed as fluid milk into manufactured dairy products.

USDA reports indicate the price for milk eligible for fluid consumption was \$4.63 per cwt. in 1965-compared to \$3.33 for milk used for manufacturing. The difference in the two prices is \$1.30 per cwt. The 1.5 billion pounds of milk times \$1.30 per cwt. would mean a loss of \$19.5 million in dairy farmers' purchasing power.

The special milk program is one of our most effective vehicles for insuring good eating habits and at the same time improving diets of all children. Certainly this important aspect of the program should not be

based on ability to pay.

Does the administration realize how much milk consumption in schools will decline if the cost per half-pint is increased? A study in Chicago schools revealed that an increase of 1 cent per half-pint on white milk and chocolate milk reduced consumption by 40 percent. This fact alone should give cause for serious reconsideration of the proposed

We urgently request that you do your utmost to combat efforts to reduce the spe-cial milk program appropriations. The program, as we know it, has the support of not only dairy farmers but the general public as well. Our younger generation would be dealt a disservice by the U.S. Congress if appropriations for this program are dropped below the current level.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES L. FARR, Dairy Economist.

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICUL-TURAL COOPERATIVES, Madison, Wis., February 11, 1966. Congressman John A. Race, House Office Building,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RACE: The Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives directs your attention to the serious situation facing dairy farmers in Wisconsin. Now underway is a serious downtrend in the Nation's milk production-resulting from farmers leaving dairying, severe culling of cows and inferior quality feed. The situation could be alleviated by increasing the level of the support price for manufactured grade milk (currently at \$3.24 per cwt. for 3.72 percent butterfat milk). The increase in the support price for milk would be achieved by increasing the purchase prices for butter, cheese, and powder at which the Commodity Credit Corporation would pay for dairy products under the price support program.

U.S. milk production for October 1965 was 2.3 percent under the previous year; November, 3 percent; and December, 4 percent. Total production for this period in 1965 totaled 28.2 billion pounds; the lowest since 1960 when production for the same period was 27.7 billion pounds. If milk deliveries continue at these levels for 1966, total production could approximate 123 billion pounds-down 2.5 billion pounds from 1965. A decline in milk production on U.S. farms of this magnitude would reduce supplies to

minimum levels.

Support purchases of dairy products for 1965 accounted for 5.7 billion pounds of milk equivalent—compared to 7.7 billion pounds in 1964. The 1965 figures are the lowest since 1960 when purchases amounted to 3 billion pounds of milk equivalent. If the decline in farm production materializes and commercial demand continues upward, there will not be adequate stocks of dairy products available to meet total demand for products in the fall months. Thus, support purchases would be nonexistent except for the flush (spring) months of production.

Dairy farmers' income would be improved through the increase in support price. Thus, dairy farmers would be in a stronger position to meet the ever rising production costs and the Nation would have ample supplies of milk and dairy products-essential for an

adequate diet.

An immediate increase in the support price for milk is vital to the butter-powder indus-Currently, the butter and powder prices are near support levels and the gross return to a dairy plant for 100 pounds of 3.5 percent butterfat milk processed into butter-powder is approximately \$3.68 (59.33 cents times 4.2 pounds butter plus 14.54 cents

times 8.2 pounds powder). However, because of the strong cheese market, Wisconsin butter-powder plants report paying prices from \$3.60 to 3.75 per hundredweight for farm bulk tank manufactured milk. Margins are barely adequate, if adequate, for defraying production costs (labor, depreciation, and supplies). Immediate relief is needed or many persons will suffer financial losses, plants will close, jobs will be lost, and farmers will be without markets.

The current cheddar cheese price is quoted 41.75 cents per pound for 40-pound blocks-compared to a support price of 36.1 cents per pound. Thus, an upward adjustment in the support price will have no immediate effect on the cheese market, but will improve the financial position of the butter-powder plants.

If the dairy industry develops an export market (commercial and payment in kind) and the Government fulfills its obligation for dairy products in foreign lands, a steady

supply is essential.

Supplemental to the price support program is the authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture in section 709 of the 1965 act to purchase dairy products on the open market to fulfill commitments.

We cannot stress strongly enough the urgency of the depressed and chaotic conditions facing dairy farmers, the dairy industry and the economy of Wisconsin. Therefore, your deliberate and forthright action in raising the level of the support price for

manufactured milk is solicited. Sincerely yours,

CHARLES L. FARR, Dairy Economist.

THE DAIRY COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE, Brookfield, Wis., February 15, 1966.

Hon. JOHN RACE, Member of Congress, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RACE: America's future rests squarely on the youth of today. To insure a steady growth in a strong, healthy, vigorous America, we must develop a strong, healthy, vigorous group of junior citizens. No other Federal programs have proven themselves like the school lunch and the school milk programs have, in providing the nutrition and proper diet, so necessary to the development of fertile minds and healthy bodies.

The proposed reduction in funds for the school lunch and school milk programs in the national budget, does not appear to be congruous with an increase in the budget for the poverty program and foreign aid. It is false reasoning to deprive schoolchildren of the nutritional benefits of their programs which have no readymade distribution supervision.

We urge you to use every avenue open to you to restore the budget on the school lunch and school milk programs to adequate levels.

Sincerely yours,

THE DAIRY COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE, EDWIN SCHMIDT, Secretary.

> ALLENTON, WIS., January 26, 1966.

Hon. JOHN A. RACE, U.S. Congressman, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RACE: I am a dairy farmer in the town of Wayne, Washington County, Wis., and I urgently plead with you to make available sufficient funds for the school milk and lunch program. The cut in the budget is surely going to hurt the farmer and is not good for the youngsters in school. Milk is good, pure food. I'm sure it's money well spent.

Sincerely,

PAUL L. SCHMITT.

PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE, Fond du Lac, Wis., January 26, 1966. Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President of the United States. The White House, Washington, D.C.

SIR: In behalf of some 15,000 dairy farmer members of Pure Milk Products Cooperative and hundreds of thousands of other farmers, school systems, children and their parents, this letter is to inform you that there is deep concern everywhere at efforts on the part of the executive branch of our Government to bring about the announced sharp reduction in the school lunch and school milk programs.

We are greatly concerned with the budget proposal which would cut the school milk appropriation for the coming fiscal year to little more than a third of current appropriations and reduce sharply the school lunch

funds

These programs have provided vital contributions to the nourishment of millions of schoolchildren who might otherwise suffer from malnutrition or lack of an adequate and balanced diet. To curtail these important programs, is to shortchange the children of our Nation, and to further encourage a lack of physical fitness on the part of youth of our country. It is inconceivable that we should shortchange our own children under the pretext of a balanced budget, while devoting hundreds of millions of dollars to

foreign aid programs. Not only are these school milk and school lunch programs important in meeting the nutritional needs of our children, they are also important factors in the building of proper diet habits in citizens of the future, and in establishing and maintaining markets present and in the future for the hardpressed dairy farmers who are the backbone of American agriculture. Reduction of these programs is another slap in the face of this important segment of agriculture. They, the dairy farmers and dairy industry are still dazed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's efforts to drive milk prices downward by the purchase of oleomargarine instead of butter for use in the diets of needy Americans and to fill domestic commitments.

We understand that the Bureau of the Budget has issued a directive to the USDA to withhold several million dollars of the money which Congress had already appropriated for use in the school milk program for the current year. We consider this a serious shortchanging of millions of underprivileged and improperly nourished schoolchildren. In addition, it thwarts the decisions in which Congress took acton to provide proper funds for these programs.

We urge immediate action to correct the flagrant departures from the stated objectives of the Great Society program. This can be done by restoring to the programs the funds appropriated by Congress, and by restoring to the budget for the coming fiscal years the money necessary to maintain both the school milk and the school lunch programs at current operating levels.

Sincerely,

WM. C. ECKLES, General Manager.

VIETNAM

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, it is the source of no little satisfaction to a Mem-

ber of Congress who supports his President on a matter of national urgency, to know that the people and the responsible press of his district also give the President their support.

On successive days, February 8 and February 9, two of the Nation's great newspapers editorially expressed such support. The two editorials spoke of two

vital questions involved:

First, our justification for being in Vietnam, and the attitude of the Vietnamese, and second, the two-dimensional aspects of the conflict.

In its editorial, the Dallas Morning News supported wholeheartedly the President's statement that "were the Communist aggressors to win in Vietnam, they would know they can accomplish through so-called wars of national liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea-or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and Malaya-or the threat of aggression in Turkey-or in a free election anywhere in the world."

The News went on to say, "South Vietnamese have given the lie to the earlier claims by the peaceniks that their hearts were not in the fight for independence."

The following afternoon, the Dallas Times Herald editorially commented on the President's conference in Hawaii and his statements, adding:

We must work as diligently at easing hardships and improving the peasants' lives as we have at formulating military strategy.

And-

Judging from President Johnson's insistence in Hawaii, the largely one-sided battle will gain this needed second dimension.

I am sure that many of my colleagues would like to read these excellent editorials in their entirety, and I am, therefore, attaching them to these remarks for the RECORD.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Feb. 8, 1966] THE REASON WHY

The President's speech in welcome to South Vietnam's Premier represented pure Johnson. It was a tough, succinct, hard-

hitting speech.

President Johnson used the occasion to blast those "special pleaders" who urge the country to sell out the South Vietnamese and our own troops. He used it to sum up, briefly and well, the reason why the defense of Vietnamese integrity is of critical importance to this country and to the world. The speech he made got the job done.

The South Vietnamese have given the lie to the earlier claims by peaceniks that their hearts were not in the fight for independence. They have continued to fight and die by the thousands in a war that seems to have no limits and no end. They fight, not only as soldiers, but as civil officials and administrators, who go to posts in Red-plagued areas where they are lucky to live for a month. The villagers themselves, whose lot is often harder and more terrifying than that of the soldiers, have continued to resist.

"They fight," the President said, "for the essential rights of human existence—and only the callous or timid can ignore their

Unfortunately, there are some of both in the President's own country and he had some choice words for them:

"There are special pleaders who counsel retreat in Vietnam. They belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope. Were we to follow their

course, how many nations might fall before the aggressor? Where would our treaties be respected, our word honored, our commitment believed?"

Over and over again these special pleaders have asked: "Why are we in Vietnam?"

If the Vietnam critics were listening to the President's speech, they heard the reason explained to them. But it seems doubtful that they were because, as he pointed out, they are deaf to all save the gloomy sounds made by themselves and their kind.

However, the reason that this country has given the lives of more than 1,300 of its young men to defend Vietnam is a valid one, and the President stated it well. He said:

"Were the Communist aggressors to win in Vietnam, they would know they can accomplish through so-called wars of national liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea-or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and Malaya—or the threat of aggression in Turkey-or in a free election anywhere in the

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Feb. 9, 1966] A TWO-DIMENSIONAL WAR

The degree of mutual understanding apparently achieved between President Johnson and South Vietnamese Premier Ky at their amicable Hawaii conference is encouraging. The two leaders may still differ on emphasis in the anti-Communist war, but fertile areas of agreement also have been found, judging from official statements, for a positive, grassroots program to aid the Vietnamese people and thereby win their support for the Ky government.

The Saigon leadership still prefers to talk more of escalated military action than about the civilian reforms needed to win the ultimate struggle with the Vietcong at the individual and village level. But Ky and his aids have shown encouraging cooperativeness in Honolulu to President Johnson's insistence that more emphasis be placed on improving the conditions in all areas as they become secured from rebel terror by military conquest. This undertaking will be even more difficult-and less dramatic-than successful combat "search and clear" operations. But realistically, it will be impossible ever to win anything but a tenuous temporary hold on any portion of Vietnam but a handful of cities by military means alone.

This is the paradox of the conflict: It can be lost through military weakness, but it cannot be won purely by military strength. The succession of Saigon governments dominated by military men have too long failed to face this reality of the dual struggle, and so have many American assistance strategists. Now, judging from President Johnson's insistence in Hawaii, the largely one-sided battle will gain this needed second dimension.

There can be no cause for overoptimism about the chances of quick success in the tedious task ahead in the villages. Similar efforts have been made before, with dismal results. But the critical situation demands a new and broader attempt, aimed at building model facilities for giving the backward, warweary Vietnamese populace every reason to prefer Saigon leadership to Vietcong occupa-Ample American aid and know-how, skillfully applied, could still work wonders.

The United States has helped establish showcases of superior Western culture and living standards elsewhere, as in West Berlin-where the contrast with communism's meager offerings was so painful the Reds had to wall in their people to keep them from flocking to it. Admittedly the job is more difficult in a remote agrarian Asian settingbut so is fighting a war. We must work as diligently at easing hardships and improv-ing the peasants' lives as we have at formulating military strategy. At the technological level, the Vietcong can't compete. We are

we have for winning over the people who are real pawns in this struggle—and keeping them "won."

PROPOSED CODE OF ETHICS FOR CONGRESS

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some hesitation and reluctance to discuss a matter that to me is both unpleasant and embarrassing. Perhaps I am breaking an unwritten rule. But the issue is of such burning importance that I hope I will be forgiven if my words seem out of order or improper in any way.

For the past few weeks I have been shocked to read a series of columns by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson which have made serious charges against the alleged activities of a Member of the other body, and his alleged relationship with Julius Klein, a public relations man, lobbyist, and registered agent for Germany.

What I found particularly painful in these columns was the nature of the charges made. It was not easy for me to read that a Member of the other body stood accused of carrying out assignments for a registered foreign agent in behalf of a foreign government.

In other words, these columns purport to show that a strange and unexplained relationship existed-or still exists-between these two men.

One letter, which I found particularly offensive, was written by a Member of the other body to a member of the German Cabinet. It strongly suggested that Members of the Congress, both Republican and Democrat, endorsed Mr. Klein and habitually seek his advice. I considered this presumptuous statement an insult to me and many of my colleagues, since it presumed to speak for me and was totally untrue.

I found the stories related in these columns so hard to believe, as a matter of fact, that I telephoned Jack Anderson and demanded to see evidence of these charges. Mr. Anderson invited me to his office to inspect his files. I sent a member of my staff to Mr. Anderson's office. He was received cordially and given full cooperation. As a matter of fact, he spent over 3 hours going through Mr. Anderson's files, which consisted of copies of correspondence, telegrams, and memos between the two men, as well as the reports of private investigators. My assistant saw all of the original material quoted in the columns, all of which he told me was unquestionable authentic. He also saw material which has not yet appeared in print, and which he assures me is even stronger and more sensational than what has already been printed in the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to judge not making fullest use of the best weapons, or condemn other people. But it seems to me on the basis of what I have seen, and in the absence of refutations or denials by the parties concerned, that these newspaper accounts might indeed be true. And if they are, one cannot avoid speculating on their implications.

The American people have had their faith shaken in the past. Only a few months ago Congress received a very bad press when armies of lobbyists invaded Capitol Hill to get sugar quotas for their clients. And, of course, before that there was the Bobby Baker scandal, which needs no further amplification from me. Over the years, influence peddling and conflicts of interest have always been unwelcome-but hardly unknown-intruders in Washington.

No one questions the right-rather, I should say the absolute duty-of a Congressman to fight for the legitimate interests of his home district and his constituents. That is one of the reasons we are here. But we must all be constantly aware of the dangers of developing too close a relationship with people or companies, and being drawn into the web of

opportunity.

These situations, and the suspicion and shame they bring to Congress, emphasize the need for a congressional code of ethics. The nature of the position of a Member of the Congress of the United States gives him virtually unlimited freedom of action. He should not be left completely to his own judgment-because judgment is elastic, and varies between individuals.

Once having established such a code, Congress must enforce it. Why should we wait until a newspaperman or some investigative agency blows the whistle.

It is the responsibility of Congress to draw the line and define the boundaries of proper behavior for its Members. It has shirked this responsibility for too long. According to the present system, Congress avoids scrutinizing its Members' activities too closely. The most flagrant violations of the public trust are overlooked, in strict accordance with traditional "club" rules. This is wrong. I would like to remind

every one of my colleagues that none of us is an innocent bystander. When the mud flies, it gets all of us dirty. We all live in one House, under one roof, and we are judged collectively by the people.

No one questions the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Congress of the United States are dedicated and highly principled people, motivated by the finest instincts. As a matter of fact, the same Jack Anderson devoted a full column last Sunday to a series of short profiles of a number of Congressmen who are scrupulous almost to a fault.

A popular song proclaims, "Happiness is different things to different people." submit that ethical behavior is in the same category. With Congress setting a standard-and enforcing it with determination-all of us will feel a little more comfortable knowing that we must all measure up to the very same standard of proper behavior.

I firmly believe that the time of decision has arrived for us to look deeply inside ourselves, individually and as a body. Past and recent events have made

it clear that one Congressman's ethical standard may not be quite exactly the same as another's. And so, for the protection of both of them, and for the Nation as a whole. I urgently request at this time that Congress give priority attention to the establishment of a code of ethical behavior for the guidance of its Members.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, while the battle for freedom continues in Vietnam, the United States and the Government of South Vietnam are making serious efforts to improve conditions in the hamlets and villages. Too often, however, the good we have done-and are doingin the field of community development is obscured by the smoke of the battlefield

It is about time we told the world more about the less visible war in South Vietnam.

The Agency for International Development provides cement, steel, building materials, equipment, food, books, and other needed materials. But just as important, it provides people—American specialists in community building. They go there of their own volition; they are staying of their own volition. Usually, the Vietcong leave the AID technicians alone. They know that the villagers are ready and willing to protect their American friends and the the things they have built together.

Few Americans can realize what it means to a village to receive help in digging a well or making a more efficient windmill. Few Americans know what it means to have the rice harvest doubled. Few Americans can know what fish from a newly stocked pond can mean to a

Vietnamese family's diet.

Yes, AID is helping Vietnam's villagers build things a man will fight for. At the end of 1964, over 8,000 self-help projects had been completed and another 6,000 were underway. In the first half of fiscal 1965 alone, some 1,600 self-help projects had been approved and 500 completed, projects involving more than 80 different activities including construction of public meeting places, rice and fish drying platforms, classrooms, bridges, privies, road and bridge repair.

The natural tendency is to think of community development programs in statistical terms but the real success of the program cannot be so measured. Its true value lies in the fact that by working together the people develop a community spirit.

Participation in the selection and management of the project is spirited, the projects are often a source of pride, and the villagers begin to have a stake in their own future. Such involvement and identification can be a key factor in defeating the Vietcong.

Community development programs, encouraged and supported by AID, are proving every day that freedom can deliver what communism can only promise.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the dedication of our AID employees in Vietnam and I call for quick approval of this request to enable them to continue their fine work

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

California?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, Estonians everywhere celebrate a landmark in the rich history of their homeland. On that day in 1918, 48 years ago, the executive committee of the National Council of Estonia proudly proclaimed to the world that henceforth the Republic of Estonia would stand in the ranks of the free nations of the world.

The road to independence had been a long one for the brave people of Estonia. filled with bitterness, death, and anguish. After the prize had been won, Estonians were forced to take up arms once more to defend their freedom. Bolshevists tried to establish their rule and push Estonia back into Russian tyranny. German volunteers, who aimed at reestablishing German supremacy, also had to be expelled. Finally, in 1920, Russia signed a peace treaty with Estonia in which she 'voluntarily and forever" renounced all claims to the territory and people of Estonia. The young republic was now free to settle down to an era of economic productivity and progressive government.

Independence for Estonia ushered in a period of significant achievement in all phases of national life. Once independence had been won, Estonians plunged fearlessly into tasks of economic, political, and social reform. The new government immediately took over the large estates owned mostly by the nobility and distributed them to the men who had fought so bravely for independence and to many others who had never known the joy of owning their own land. As a result of the land reform program, agricultural production expanded tremendously.

On the political and social fronts, great progress was also made. A democratic constitution was adopted. Legislation was passed, requiring all children between the ages of 7 and 14 to attend school. Nearly all citizens learned to read and write. Schools were built at an impressive rate. Estonia supported professional and technical schools that trained lawyers, doctors, dentists, engineers, artists, and musicians. An 8-hour day was introduced.

Music, art, and cultural pursuits of all kinds flourished as Estonians enjoyed the blessing of freedom without fear of government reprisal. The number and scope of newspapers grew considerably.

ROKESSIA

In 1939 Estonia boasted 15 daily newspapers. Freedom of religion was complete, and the various religious denominations were able to conduct their af-

fairs as they chose.

For 22 years the noble Estonian people worked to establish a strong and independent state, only to witness sorrowfully the end of independence with the coming of the terrible Second World War. In 1940, the Russians brutally occupied Estonia and staged fake elections, which made Estonia a part of the Soviet Union. In the first 12 months of Soviet occupation more than 60,000 Estonians of all ages and classes, or about 5 percent of her total population, were either killed or deported. On the night of June 13-14, 1941, alone, more than 10,-000 were removed from their homeland forever.

German rule supplanted Russian domination from 1941 until 1944, when the Soviet Union again tyrannized the little land. With the return of Russian rule, numerous arrests were made, many Estonians were put to death, and thousands were deported to Russian labor camps. Peasant farms which had been so proudly and carefully tended, were brought into collectives. Industries were nationalized. Religion was discouraged. Education was changed to conform to Russian ideas. Russians re-placed the majority of Estonians in places of authority in the Government. Estonians were again subjected to the horror and indignity of deportation. In 1945 and 1946 about 20,000 Estonians were deported. The third large deportation occurred in 1949 when about 40,000 persons, mostly farmers who had resisted collectivization, were wrenched forever from their homes and families.

Estonians have suffered greatly under Russian tyranny. Yet through all the long years of hardship and oppression the people of Estonia have carefully preserved their own language, ancient folklore, way of life, and their indomitable will to be free. They have never relinquished the fervent hope that someday their freedom will be restored.

We who enjoy the blessings of liberty reaffirm on this glorious Estonian independence day that we will never cease our efforts to bring freedom to all men everywhere. We thus observe today both a glorious event in the life of Estonia and a renewal of our own sense of duty toward all captive peoples. With this in mind, it is a happy privilege for me to extend warmest best wishes to my many friends of Estonian descent in my own Ninth District of Massachusetts, in the United States, and throughout the world on their independence day.

Congratulations to a great people.

WATER MANAGEMENT-ITS MEANING

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a very frank and elucidating discussion on water management was presented to the National Water Conference in Washington last December 9, by John E. Kinney. a sanitary engineering consultant from Ann Arbor, Mich. It merits wide circulation, particularly among Federal, State, and local government officials.

Mr. Kinney is convinced, and I think properly so, that lack of understanding and professional competency-in company with bureaucratic ambition-are preventing or at least delaying development of solutions to our water problems. He contends that the water famine is more a famine in knowledge and ideas than in water.

Candid criticism of this nature is refreshing and instructive. While voicing his objections to the overall approaches to water problems, Mr. Kinney is quick to cite instances where proper leadership is accomplishing sound water management. He credits the Ohio River Sanitation Commission for its progress in pollution control, and Governor Rockefeller is commended for his New York State program because "he substituted facts for platitudes, understanding for regulations, and technical assistance for public indictments."

If, as it now appears, industry and the general public are going to give the Rockefeller program the support and cooperation that it merits, New York's discouraging outlook for water supply will be reversed in a relatively short time. The ORSANCO record is a case history in effective pollution reduction.

When eight States joined in 1948 to form a compact—ORSANCO—approved by Congress to pool their resources and police powers for control of interstate water pollution on the Ohio and its tributaries, more than 99 percent of the population along the thousand miles of river discharged raw sewage and a variety of industries poured volumes of dregs and waste into the once-clear waters. Today treatment plants are in operation or under construction for 94 percent of the valley's sewage, and 90 percent of the 1,730 industrial plants along the waterways have installed facilities that meet ORSANCO's basiccontrol requirements.

ORSANCO has come a long way, but its members will not be satisfied with a job that is only partly finished. There can never be a letup along a waterway where population continues to rise and more and more generating, processing, and manufacturing plants are located. The major lesson to be learned from ORSANCO is that it was not formulated upon the selfish interests of a single community or State, nor was it conceived in an atmosphere of panic that emphasizes immediate needs without thought of long-range planning. The attack on Lake Erie pollution has been slow in coming, but the program now underway will be successful if all the affected States—and Canadian Provinces well-join together in the same spirit and with the same vigor that has been the history of ORSANCO.

America can lick the water problem, but it is going to take a heap of understanding, determination, and money. Pollution abatement alone is not enough. Water must be used efficiently, recycling of industrial water for reuse is an important factor; and converting brackish and ocean waters to fresh water is mandatory. There are still dams and reservoirs to be built, but, as Mr. Kinney points out, their desirability and serviceability must be determined by accurate statistics and not by political expediency.

Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I should like to have the Kinney address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

WATER MANAGEMENT-ITS MEANING

(By John E. Kinney)

The Peanuts comic strip by Schulz provides a course in psychology and a means of assessing the forces in water management. If you follow Charlie Brown's daily entanglements with human nature, the observation that viewpoint makes the difference will adequately explain why we have platitudes on water management but no common understanding as to its meaning.

Those who appraise the tactics of Lucy, his principal adversary, have an intimate understanding of why the importance of water management is not sufficient justification for a common resolution of its meaning.

When Charlie Brown attempts to rationalize some action or hope, he soon learns he stands alone. If he attempts to convince Lucy, the results can be nearly fatal. Her classic remark, after bowling him over-"I had to hit him. He was beginning to make sense"—offers the essence of the rationale and reaction by many who have issued ultimatums based on preconceived ideas or desires.

If Charlie Brown attempts to seek support from Linus, there is promise but no action. Linus, the epitome of insecurity, can be easily dissuaded by Lucy with an admonition such as: "Don't burn all your bridges

behind you."

Enlisting the support of Sally or Violet is even more hopeless. The cause may be serious but it can't, in any measure, match the importance of hair styling, clothes or any other item of similar personal concern. And Schroder, his life is dedicated to Beethoven.

Even Snoopy, the dog, lets Charlie know there is a responsibility for the master to feed the subject but this responsibility should not be confused with any assumed authority to command respect or action.

Our protagonists in water management can be categorized into these counterparts in the Peanuts comic strip. The word pro-tagonist is used advisedly. The heat of distagonist is used advisedly. The heat of dis-sention, the incompatability of objectives and the stridently voiced demands support no other.

SCOPES OF MANAGEMENT

The trend continues to let today's expediency control rather than anticipate tomorrow's needs. For example, the glamour of the big dam with the scenery of the lake it creates is more appealing than the importance of the land flooded or the availability of water from below the surface of the earth.

Yet there is a reserve in water supply not far below land surface which, according to Geological Survey estimates, is some 34 times the annual runoff of all the rivers in the Nation. There is probably an equal volume in deep ground storage. Our underground water supplies exceed in volume those in our lakes and reservoirs. This should be a sobering and reassuring factor but it gets little attention. Rather than manage surface and underground waters jointly, we rely on one or the other. Our much-publicized

water famine is more a famine in knowledge and ideas than in water.

The limitations in adequately defining water management are evident in other actions. In some areas transfer of water from one drainage basin to another is not acceptable, even when it could pay long-term benefits. Other areas rely solely on imported water and, under one pretext or another, make no effort to utilize or reuse waters within the

And if that is not sufficient cause for confusion, some believe that treating waste waters so as to make them as clean as possible will solve our dilemmas. Others, meanwhile, with more understanding, are arguing for a classification of waters, just as land use is classified. These persons argue that all uses should be provided for in every area but not necessarily all in the same water.

There are also controversies over present and future uses. The present economic importance of the water resource to our way of life can be argued as all important, or lightly dismissed with the nebuolus inanity that water is so important to our future continued existence, economics cannot be a limiting

consideration.

Through all this three things are apparent: 1. Water development (so-called water management) in this country has been characterized by short-term solutions without the knowledge, understanding, or data which would allow decisions to be made with more logic and a better insight into the results of choices open to us.
2. The details can be all important. The

picture of a sewer outfall or a low reservoir is more important than the corrective pro-

gram underway.

3. Specific areas of self-interest have nurtured a public concept of perennial water shortages and gross pollution. This is being exploited for political vote-getting purposes, It has also led to a tendency for some in high positions in Government to grasp for authority and funds, not for purposes of protection of society, but for organizational and professional power and aggrandizement of self or

PERSONAL MEANING OF MANAGEMENT

Going back to the Peanuts comic strip provides a method to depict a very large segment of the public. Represented by Linus, they consider water adequately managed as long as they reap the benefits and do not feel the fury. For most this means no flood damage, and, more importantly, when they turn on the faucet the water flows clean and safe to

Their thoughts encompass no more than that until they read articles on droughts or on polluted beaches. At such times the negative controls; they perceive the lack of management.

For these people the only remedy necessary is a dam, a strong law, or a Federal sub-But whatever remedy is adopted, it must be now.

Real panic sets in if this soul of insecurity should be told that the water may stop flowing from his faucet by the year 2010, or that the lakes are dying. To forestall such hor-rendous possibilities, he will gladly endorse any project advertised as a guaranteed solu-This endorsement doesn't require a check on the accuracy or immediacy of the Nor does it await any independent, technically competent evaluation of the real

value of the proposed cure.
"Dying Lake Erie" has excited many wakes. The disturbed individuals attending the demise of this body of water have neglected to learn that the best-educated estimates of the actual time of the death is some 10,000 years from now. The more immediate problems of education, slums, and delinquency are either of less importance or too much of a challenge for those who emotionally demand action now to save Lake Erie.

In an emotional pitch before the "United Action for Clear Water" conference called by the United Auto Workers in Detroit on November 6, a representative from HEW told the union members that the lifeblood of jobs in the steel, chemical and paper industries is water; that Lake Erie is rapidly dying-"filling in with algae and solids"-and with its death there goes their jobs. The fear of loss of jobs with loss of income is real. The threat worked. The audience wanted action to force the industries to stop polluting the water now-to stop destroying the lake which is providing the water for their jobs. One wonders why the industries don't appreciate that pollution will close down their mills.

I have vet to hear any audience discussing juvenile delinquency, attacks on women, or substandard education reach the emotional pitch generated at meetings demanding action to save Lake Erie. Our sense of values at times is most questionable.

AN EXAMPLE OF ACTION

If you were to investigate your home area activities carried on under the guise of water management, the confusion of agencies involved would be a revelation. The blinders worn by those promoting progress at any cost might not be readily apparent but with time would be evident.

As an example, consider the proposal now underway to place a reservoir on a creek upstream from Ann Arbor, Mich., in the Huron River basin. This reservoir is touted to the public as providing flood control, low flow augmentation, water supply, recreation and habitat for fish and wildlife. Since everyone is promised a benefit, the public appeal is terrific.

Ann Arbor's future water needs could be supplied by simply connecting to the Metropolitan Detroit authority, but developing further surface supplies seemed more desirable to some. To get a study at no cost as well as a vehicle to invite Federal funds for construction, the assistance of the Corps of Engineers was solicited by a basin promoting committee.

Since the Corps is limited to projects which have flood control benefits, some justification had to be devised. If the lower river channel is not widened as much as planned, and if the optimistic population forecasts are accurate for the year 2000, then it was estimated that a possible flood damage of \$145,000 a year might then be realized in the lower river. The door was opened for a "free" study.

Ann Arbor has secondary treatment of sewage. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report estimated a need of four times their reported present low flow in the river by the year 2015 to provide high dissolved oxygen downstream from the treatment plant.

However, it seems HEW used data considered in error and the low flow is now said to be three times that reported. The Corps of Engineers is assuming no responsibility for determining the accuracy of measurements. So far HEW has not agreed to revise its report. The flow augmentation benefits are as subject to criticism as are the flood benefits.

Only one of six possible sites has been promoted. The site covers some 14,000 acres of the most fertile agricultural land in the basin. The natural flatness of the land will result in only 1,500 acres with water more than 9 feet deep. Over 6,000 acres will have less than 2 feet of water.

Some of the less desirable features are over. Because this creek drains fertile farmland, the algae now in farm ponds will bloom in abundance in the shallow water. As the water level drops the algae will die and the city water supply can expect continuous taste and odor problems, such as it now experiences in spring and

fall. The mudflats will provide excellent mosquito breeding.

Of greater significance, however, is the limitation on the Corps of Engineers which orients all considerations toward flood control benefits. This bias does not allow a total and impartial assessment of the area's economic and social needs.

Regardless of the term "multipurpose," incompatible purposes such as low flow augmentation and recreation cannot be best served by the same reservoir. In a given area several single-purpose reservoirs could be vastly more effective. Yet, the Corps of Engineers mission denies this possibility. And, in addition, the value of land as a resource must be considered as of comparable significance in satisfying future area needs. Evaluating land in terms of today's markets, and water in terms of value 100 years hence, is less than reasonable.

Objection by the farmers to the loss of their land is considered as selfish by many concerned solely with the dire forecasts of future water shortages. However, we cannot continue to dismiss alternatives to basin needs simply because groups employ the tactics of Lucy and either dominate decision or destroy objection by scornful comment.

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF WATER MANAGEMENT?

At present there are platitudes and sound scientific generalizations espoused by professional and student. But, among the public, water management is simply defined by each person as satisfying or promising to satisfy his personal wants. So long as there is the promise, there is no demand to ascertain facts or evaluate projections on alternatives. Education has provided tools for en-hancing our scale of living but it has failed miserably in enhancing the ability of the individual to think objectively.

If Charlie Brown were to look at the history of the ancients who used water in expertly designed structures but perished because they did not use water and land wisely, and if Charlie were then to study in detail the manner in which we Americans are also building expertly designed structures but not using our water and land wisely, his conclusion undoubtedly would be that, regardless of how sincere or how well intentioned unbridled enthusiasm may be, it is no substitute for competency. Charlie would express it quite simply: "Good grief."

WHAT IS NEEDED FOR WATER MANAGEMENT

Our ever-increasing pandemonium con-tinues because we lack competent leadership and argue over ill-defined goals. This situation could be corrected:

If the principal task of scientific water resources investigations is kept separate from the equally important functions of law enforcement, regulation, and capital construc-

If the executive branch of the Government accepts the responsibility of establishing a more reasonable balance in the budget among the various needs for research, investigation, and construction:

If the Bureau of the Budget would learn how the costly "comprehensive planning" by HEW and the Corps of Engineers is being deliberately bypassed by HEW in order to establish precedent and authority, under the guise of pollution control, before the comprehensive surveys are concluded;

If the technically competent assert professional status by assuming responsibility for recommendations in difficult decisions;

If political and technical leaders define specific goals and guidelines rather than continue the fallacy that a continuing progression of ever-stronger laws with increased appropriations can substitute for competency.

Leadership in accomplishing water management is possible. ORSANCO (the Ohio

River Valley Water Sanitation Commission) has shown how the pollution control aspects can be attained. And now Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has taken the cry out of crisis in New York State. In lieu of denunciation of deplorable conditions, he directed attention to specific goals. He outlined a 6-year program to cost \$1 billion, and the people bought it. Governor Rockefeller substituted facts for platitudes, understanding for regulations, and technical assistance for public indictments. While he promised to attempt to get Federal moneys, he induced the people to use their own money and get started.

History will separate the leaders from the haranguers. The means is simple and has stood the test of time. Fanciful inventions and distortions of fact, whether deliberate or not, give glory which is soon exhausted "for the mind can repose only on the stability of truth."

And that goes for management of water, too. We need less "Good grief" and more "Let's play ball." We need fewer Lucys and more Charlie Browns.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LAIRD. - Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader what is the program for the remainder of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman, this concludes our legislative business for this week, and it will be our purpose, after announcement of the program, to ask to go over to next week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day. There are no bills. But Monday is being set aside for eulogies for our late beloved colleague, Albert Thomas, of Texas.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day, and there will be considered H.R. 12889, the supplemental defense authorization bill. under an open rule with 3 hours of debate, waiving points of order.

For Wednesday and the remainder of the week there will be considered:

S. 1666, to provide for additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, under an open rule with 1 hour

H.R. 9963, the Alaska Centennial of 1967, under an open rule, with 2 hours of debate.

H.R. 12322, the Cotton Research and Promotion Act.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of Members of the House today to the 48th anniversary of Estonian Independence Day. Unfortunately, the brave people of Estonia are now among the captive peoples of communism, and this great day in their history cannot be celebrated in their homeland because of the tyranny of their Red rulers.

We must rededicate ourselves, therefore, on this great historic day for the Estonians, to continued efforts to see that freedom is restored to these proud people and all the other captives of communism.

The Estonians proclaimed their independence after the tsarist government fell and from 1918 until 1940, when their country fell to the Communist forces, they enjoyed a period of freedom and progress.

We must not only commemorate historic national days such as Estonian Independence Day, Mr. Speaker, but we must take practical steps to indicate our interest in the restoration of freedom to the captive peoples of communism. One such practical move would be the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, an action which I have repeatedly urged the House to take.

I also think the Voice of America should provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the people of Estonia. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America has been cutting back both its hours of broadcast in the Estonian language and in the nature of these broad-The Voice of America gives casts. straight news only and is fearful of of-fending the Soviet Union under the policy of the present administration. I believe the Estonian people deserve the truth, and the Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering it to them to counteract the brainwashing of constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection. Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, last night I attended a dinner at the Washington Hilton Hotel commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946. In our Capital City of Washington, D.C., unemployment of unskilled persons is as high as any other place in the United States. Welfare costs are enormous in Washington, D.C.

Nevertheless, every single waiter and busboy who served the guests at this celebration of the Employment Act was imported from Europe. Each imported worker takes a good job from some unemployed U.S. citizen.

Each waiter last night was recruited by the hotel from throughout Europe. Each waiter last night was cleared by the Department of Labor under Public Law

We heard messages from three Presidents telling how great and effective the Employment Act has been. President Johnson reported how good the employment conditions are in the United States today-but he did not mention the hotel and restaurant industry in our large cities.

Where is the Federal Government, where are the District officials, where are the labor unions, where are the poverty workers who sit by idly and unconcernedly, permitting thousands of workers from Europe to be imported to work in hotels and restaurants in Washington, and other U.S. cities, taking jobs from U.S. citizens who are unemployed, and on the welfare and relief rolls.

Cannot our local unemployed citizens be trained for these jobs more effectively. and more profitably, than recruiting and importing foreign workers?

This incongruous situation may be too practical and mundane for consideration in the intellectual atmosphere of the symposium held in conjunction with the 20th anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946.

But how can governmental officials, labor union bosses, and unemployed workers continuously ignore the importation of one kind of labor force-and permit able-bodied U.S. citizens to remain and to atrophy on the welfare rolls?

Perhaps the hotel industry in Washington, D.C., cannot afford to pay wages high enough to attract a domestic labor force. Perhaps the hotel industry cannot afford losses. Perhaps labor union officials in the hotel industry lack the courage of the labor union officials working in the agricultural industry. Perhaps the Department of Labor is more interested in the hotel industry than in the agricultural industry. Perhaps the poverty program cannot train hotel and restaurant workers.

Also, Mr. Speaker, how can we permit the permanent importation of foreign hotel and restaurant workers when many unemployed U.S. workers eagerly seek these good and desirable jobs and, at the same time, deny growers of vegetable row crops any opportunity to import workers even temporarily to avoid crop losses at peak harvest times when few domestic workers desire farmwork at all?

I would like an explanation of this seeming paradox—from the Department of Labor, the administration, a labor union official, or from the Washington, D.C., Welfare Department. I suspect that any factual explanation would be embarrassing to every group and agency involved. I do not, therefore, expect an explanation. But refusal to explain does not make the situation correct or tolerable.

BIG GOVERNMENT—FRIEND OR FOE?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, at Stanford University, delivered an address on January before the San Diego Open Forum, entitled "Big Government—Friend or Foe?"

Mr. Freeman has developed some very thought-provoking suggestions which I am sure will be of interest to all of the readers of the Record interested in Government.

His address follows:

BIG GOVERNMENT-FRIEND OR FOE?

(By Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member, the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University, San Diego Open Forum, January 9, 1966)

"DAS LIED VON DER GLOCKE

"Wohltaetig ist des Feuer's Macht
Wenn sie der Mensch bezaehmt, bewacht,
Und was er bildet, was er schafft,
Das dankt er dieser Himmelskraft;
Doch furchtbar wird die Himmelskraft
Wenn sie der Fessel sich entrafft,
Einhertritt auf der eignen Spur,
Die freie Tochter der Natur.
Wehe, wenn sie losgelassen.
—"Friedrich von Schiller."

[Translation]

"THE SONG OF THE BELL

"Beneficent the might of flame,
When 'tis by man watch'd o'er, made tame;
For to this heav'nly power he owes
All his creative genius knows;
Yet terrible that power will be,
When from its fetters it breaks free,
Treads its own path with passion wild,
As nature's free and reckless child.
Woe, if it casts off its chains."

In the year 1965 the American people enjoyed—more or less—\$675 billion economy and a \$210 billion government. While all

Americans, from right to left, like a steady and rapid increase in national income and product, they are less than unanimous in their feelings about the expansion of government. Some believe that government has grown too fast, become too big, and should be cut down to size. Others are just as convinced that government is not doing nearly all it ought to, that it is being starved and should be enlarged. A third group's argument is not so much with the size of government itself but with what it does and how it does it. So, it seems to come down largely to a question of what government should be doing—or leave alone.

Governments, the Declaration of Independence proclaims, are instituted among men to secure certain unallenable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It goes on to say that whenever government becomes destructive of those ends, the people have the right to alter

or abolish it.

Nobody—or almost nobody—has argued that government in the United States has become so destructive that it ought to be abolished. But many observers are critical of the course set by government and would alter its direction if they could. Some question defense and foreign policies and hold that our national security, present and future, is in jeopardy, that it is less well protected from potential aggression than it need be or should be.

Others contend that government's domestic activities have not helped to secure and widen the liberty and pursuit of happiness of its citizens. Government, they say, is of course doing many things without which a civilized society could not exist. But its tendency to extend the range and intensity of its functions and to penetrate deeply into affairs which used to be regarded as being in the private sphere, narrows and endangers individual freedom. That, they hold, is the very nature of government. "Liberty has never come from the government," Woodrow Wilson wrote, reminding us that "the history of liberty is the history of limitations on governmental powers, not the increase of it."

Thomas Jefferson, in his later years, looking back over the experiences of his long life, concluded that "the natural progress is for liberty to yield and for government to gain ground." Just 15 years ago a freshman Massachusetts Congressman wrote:

"The scarlet thread running through the thoughts and actions of people all over the world is the delegation of great problems to the all-absorbing Leviathan—the state. • • • Every time that we try to lift a problem to the government we are sacrificing the liberties of the people."

That young Congressman's name was John

Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Throughout recorded history men who fought for liberty fought against a government. At times, of course, they warred against a foreign ruler. But more often they warred battled a domestic government they deemed to be tyrannical. The observance of democratic procedures, many Americans believe, assures us of the preservation of liberty and eliminates any possibility of tyranny. But the holding of elections, even if honest and free, does not protect a minority against oppression by a majority. Nor does it safe-guard a majority against a chief executive who commands the power and skill to bend or beat legislators, communities, local officials, civic, and business leaders into submission. All member countries of the United Nations maintain some symbols of democracy although in many or most of them the people have little power over the conduct of their government.

When a government tightens the rules under which its residents must live and limits their freedom of action, it always does so in the name of the people and for their pre-

sumed benefit. It may retain established rituals and honored traditions by which it stakes out a seemingly respectable claim to legitimacy. Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin claimed to be governing in the long-range interest and for the good of their citizens, many of whom (and at times a majority of whom) believed, at least temporarily, that it was all done for their own "liberty and pursuit of happiness." Almost 40 years ago Mr. Justice Brandels, one of the leading liberals of his day, warned:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evilminded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidous encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding (Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 478).

If we define freedom as the ability of the individual to make meaningful choices between known alternatives, then it follows that the extent of his freedom depends on the range of decisions which he can make for himself and his family or which are being made for him. The larger a share of his product or resources government takes from him and spends for him, the less he can allocate to his manifold needs and wants-for housing, education, health, support of aged parents, etc.-according to his own judgment, desire or preference. Even if his freedom of action is not explicitly circumscribed, the economic penalty for exercising it-such as preferring a nongovernmental to a governmental "free" servicebecomes prohibitive. And as a central government enforces uniformity in all local areas throughout its realm, it destroys its citizens' freedom of choice.

This seems to suggest that the basic issue is the size of taxing and public spending and that the extent of individual liberty can be measured by the percentage of the national income or product which is channeled through government. An often repeated definition of the difference between a liberal and a conservative is that the liberal wants government to spend more and the conservative wants it to spend less. There is just enough truth in this oversimplification to make it plausible and widely accepted. But it misses some crucial points and does not aid understanding.

Conservatives and liberals alike recognize

Conservatives and liberals alike recognize that in the second half of the 20th century the government of an industrial nation, and a world leader at that, must be big government. What divides liberals and conservatives is not so much their views on the necessary or desirable magnitude of public spending as a conflict on the needs and means of government.

I am not at all certain that at this point in history public expenditures in the United States would be much lower, if any, if conservatives set public policy rather than liberals. But I am sure that part of the funds would be allocated to other purposes than now, that the money would be spent in a different manner, that taxes to foot the bill would be differently structured, and that responsibility and decisionmaking power among levels of government would be significantly changed.

IS GOVERNMENT GROWING?

Before discussing the major ideological and policy issues I need to clarify some questions of fact. Conservatives have tended to show in their presentations that public spending has grown disproportionately fast in recent

^{&#}x27;I am using the terms "liberal" and "conservative" in the sense in which they have come to be generally understood in the United States although this is a perversion of their original and true meaning and differs from their use abroad.

years and decades. But reports by liberals commonly reveal no extraordinary expansion. They say, or seem to be saying, that Government is not really growing when facts and figures are expressed in meaningful terms. Both sides back up their claims with the ceremonial impressiveness of research and statistical tables. Much as I hate to become involved in statistical arguments which are hard to unravel and explain, I cannot avoid dealing with this disagreement on the historical record.

Slightly over a year ago in a speech to the Committee for Economic Development Presi-

dent Johnson said:

"Total Federal spending in 1965 will be the lowest in 14 years in terms of our gross national product. * * * There are fewer Federal employees now than there were a year ago when I took office."

In his January 1965 budget message Mr.

Johnson offered this comment:

"We have good reason to expect that Government expenditures in the years ahead will grow more slowly than the gross national product, so that the ratio of Federal spending to our total output will continue to de-cline * * * had Federal civilian employment kept its 1955 relationship to population, Federal employees would have totaled 2,747,000 on June 30, 1964, more than 275,000 above the actual number as of that date."

The conclusion from this is clear: Federal spending grows at a slower pace than the national product, Federal employment more slowly than population. That parallels the impression which a number of books and articles by liberal economists aim to give us.

Let us first talk about the size of governmental employment which has been a sensitive subject ever since the famous charge in

ne Declaration of Independence;
"He has * * * sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people; and eat out their

substance.'

Over the past 10 years Federal civilian employment grew 6 percent which is one-third of the rate of the simultaneous increase in the U.S. population of 18 percent. This seems to reverse a long-range historical trend: In the first half of this century the U.S. population doubled while Federal employment multiplied tenfold.

But, as so often, the total hides some sig-

nificant facts:

Between 1955 and 1965 employment in the Defense Department declined by 13 percent, in the Post Office Department climbed 16 percent (almost parallel to population) and in the rest of the executive establishment jumped 31 percent. In other words, a sharp and disproportionate increase of Federal employment in domestic fields was partially offset by a cutback in defense. Moreover, the rise in Federal employment was kept down by delegating the field administration of most of the new and expanded Federal programs to State and local governments. Thus, the added employees were statistically classified as State and local, although they carry out programs enacted by Congress, work under orders from Washington agencies, and are at least in part paid from Federal

Total governmental employment (Federal-State-local) jumped 46 percent over the past 10 years while U.S. population grew 18 percent, private employment 16 percent. 1955 there was one person on the public payroll for every 8.1 in private employment, by 1965 the ratio was down to 1:6.2, and still falling.

Now let us look at the spending picture. The final fiscal data for 1965 are not yet available, but I am certain that when the new budget documents are released, in about 2 weeks, they will show that total Federal spending in 1965 (the cash-consolidated budget, not the administrative budget which omits about one-fourth of all Federal spending) as a percentage of gross national product was not the lowest in 14 years, as President Johnson predicted it would. They will, however, disclose a remarkable record of stability in Federal spending in proportion to national product: Federal expenditures grew 73.5 percent over the past 10 years, gross national product 71.1 percent. This seems national product 71.1 percent. to confirm the statement that Government is not growing more rapidly than the national

But we find a parallel here to what we discovered in Federal employment: Outlays for national defense increased 24 percent-barely ahead of the intervening rise in prices—and if we add space research and technology and international affairs to arrive at a total that we might call national security, they went up 37 percent. In other words, national security spending barely rose when expressed in constant dollars, and declined as a percentage of gross national product. The cost of domestic Government services meanwhile jumped 173 percent, an advance at two and a half times the rate of growth in gross national product. It may be worthwhile noting that the administration spent \$2 billion less for defense than it had estimated a year ago, \$3 billion more for all other purposes.

While Federal spending for civilian purposes soared 173 percent, personal consumpexpenditures rose only 66 percent. Families and individuals increased their personal outlays for food by 40 percent, for clothing by 44 percent, for housing and household operations by 77 percent. other words, government consumption gained sharply on personal consumption over

the past 10 years.

To view the trend in historical perspective: it required 160 years—from 1789 to 1949—for Federal expenditures for civilian purposes to reach a level of \$10 billion. It took only another 17 years, to fiscal 1966, to lift them from \$10 billion to over \$54 billion. That dramatic boost in Federal spending since World War II is sometimes explained as having been made necessary by a lag on the part of State and local governments. But State and local governments raised their appropriations for local services several times faster than the simultaneous growth in population and prices. Just in the past 10 years they boosted expenditures from their own sources by 110 percent of which less than 40 percent can be attributed to added numbers of people and higher prices. On a per capita, constant dollar basis governmental spending (Federal-State-local) for domestic purposes grew at three times the rate of personal consumption between 1954 and 1964. This may have been good, bad or indifferent. But it does establish that the domestic activities of government have been growing at a dramatic rate, in relative as well as in absolute terms. And it suggests that we carefully consider where a continuation of current trends will take us.

THE COST OF GOVERNMENT

Governmental expenditures in the United States in 1964 equalled 32 percent of the gross national product and 39 percent of the national income, with most of those huge funds collected in the form of taxes. American taxpayers have been bearing their load with a remarkable patience, probably for two reasons: (1) Tax rates were boosted to their exorbitant levels during wartime when the public was prepared to put up with almost anything; (2) A substantial share of the taxes enjoys a low visibility, being hidden from sight through indirect taxation and withholding.

The share of defense (including space and foreign aid) has declined from 82 percent of all public expenditures in 1944 to cent in 1954 and to 30 percent in 1964. Government revenues still equal the per-they centage of gross national product reached at the height of World War II. This means, (a) that taxation has been main-

tained at approximately its wartime level with cuts in some taxes offset by boosts in others, and, (b) that taxes were not kept high for defense but in order to expand the domestic activities of government.

It is now generally recognized that a burden of the size which the American taxpayer has been bearing for close to a quarter century represses economic growth. But hopes for effective tax relief are likely to be disappointed as long as public services keep growing at a spectacular pace.

Because heavy taxes are economically and politically painful, the U.S. Government has been reluctant to impose rates high enough to meet expenditures. Its budget has shown big deficits for 6 years in succession-and has been in the red for most of the past 36 years. This helped to keep taxes lowerbut how much genuine relief did it provide?

The value of the dollar was cut to less than half over the past 25 years, which amounts to a confiscation of much of the lifetime savings and retirement income of many millions of men and women. Some of them milions of men and women. Some of them just tightened their belts, some joined the ranks of our "poverty population," and not a few were forced to depend on public assistance or on charity. The big cushion of accumulated savings kept price rises to a more moderate level than might have been expected in so many years of budgetary deficits. But does perpetual inflation, which means expropriation from large segments of the population, seem to be a fair method of financing government?

The rate of inflation has turned more moderate in the past 10 years: consumer prices rose 18 percent, prices in the gross national product 22 percent. A 20-percent loss in 10 years may not appear excessive but when it is applied to fixed incomes or to insurance. bonds, or savings accounts over a long period or a lifetime, it amounts to a severe punishment of the provident for putting their trust in the dollar and the promises of the U.S. Government. It also boosts the interest cost of mortgages very substantially.

The dollar is further endangered by our continuing negative balance of payments and the resulting loss of one-third of our gold reserve. Although the private economy has had a consistently favorable balance of payments, Government action has almost exclusively focused on business activitiesthrough restraints which are called voluntary and by threats of more drastic compulsory controls-instead of putting its own house in order.

The overall weight of taxation may possibly do less economic damage than its structure. Our income tax rate scale acts like a schedule of graduated speeding fines which are intended to discourage speeding. Some drivers will speed regardless, hoping to get away with it, but most will take it easy. may taxpayers.

It is unlikely that men will work to the limit of their capacity if they know that a substantial share, or the greater share, of the product of their efforts will be taken from them. We put a penalty on effort and success and place a premium on leisure for the potentially most productive segment of our population. The top rate was cut from 91 percent to 70 percent in 1964 but the progressive character of the income tax was reinforced.

The economic cost of steeply progressive taxation is no deterrent to its protagonists. Demand for redistribution of income through progressive taxes and parallel action on the spending side is a fundamental tenet of the liberal faith. It is based on the ethical concept that the rewards and punishments of the market are inherently unfair, that success is fortuitous and failure undeserved, that accidental and environmental factors rather than individual endeavor determine human fate, and that to correct those injustices, Government must overrule the market through the political process.

Those who believe otherwise hold that there is a positive relationship between merit and success where market forces are permitted free play, that applied intelligence and sustained effort will as a rule and with some exceptions prevail over environment and find their deserved reward, and that consistent failure is no accident. They regard governmental redistribution of income through steep progressive taxation to be tyranny—besides being economically harmful

A man from whom government takes 40, 50, or up to 70 cents out of every additional dollar he earns may regard this system as exploitation of an economically productive minority by a vote-strong majority and view his status as one of involuntary servitude to forces and for purposes he deems objectionable. If he cannot find an escape hatch—a so-called loophole—he may resolve not to serve (i.e., work) any more than he necessarily has to and prefer to extend his leisure.

The cost of big government of the type we have known for some years is probably greater than the number of dollars it spends. It includes the losses it causes by inflation, the slowdown in economic growth through ill-conceived taxation, the discouragement of some of its best talent to put forth a maximum effort.

THE SERVICES OF BIG GOVERNMENT

Most of the major services which government provides such as education, welfare, roads, parks, and dozens of others are legitimate subjects of public concern. Their benefits are all-pervading and society could not progress or even exist without them. They justify and require many billions of public spending. The question is: How much is genuinely needed and where do we reach the point of diminishing returns?

About 8 years ago John Kenneth Galbraith in "The Affluent Society" advanced the proposition that the consumer luxuriates while government and its services are being starved. His solution: tax the former more heavily so as to expand the latter. Galbraith has since become the prophet and spokesman for governmental expansion, probably more because of his eloquence than of his reporting of facts or economic analysis.

Those who oppose the Galbraith thesis are said to be "against government." This is sheer calumny. It makes no more sense to be against government than to be against electricity. Both are essential and friends of man—if they come in the right quantity, when and where needed. A surge of power, beyond need or capacity, at the wrong place or in the wrong form, will wreak havoc and may turn into a killer—whether it be electricity or government.

Many accepted the Galbraith thesis because it seemed to explain a well-known phenomenon: public services always appear to be inadequate or scarce—space for driving and parking, funds for assistance to needy, classrooms and teachers, public parks and sanitation and dozens of others. But there is no shortage of automobiles or TV sets or houses or clothing.

Why is this so? Because there is no limit to human wants or desires. Our appetite for private goods is disciplined by the necessity of paying for them. There can be no shortage of goods in a free market for people willing to pay a fair price (save for war or emergency conditions or temporary dislocations). When effective demand rises unexpectedly, supply will soon catch up with it.

But most public services are not paid for by the user directly or not fully; they seem to come "for free" with the cost borne by somebody else or by that distant abstraction "the government." And as long as goods can be had gratis or below cost, demand will always exceed supply.

Galbraith ridiculed American extravagance in automobiles and homes and contrasted it with our miserliness toward schools and public parks. But the record tells us that over the past 10 years private spending for automobiles increased 75 percent, public spending for education 146 percent, private spending for housing and household operation 77 percent, for private recreation 76 percent, for local public parks and recreation 141 percent. If we carry the comparisons farther back, they show a similar picture. Public consumption has been rising twice as fast as personal.

Enrollment in public education grew 42 percent over the past 10 years, employment in public education 79 percent. School construction proceeded so rapidly that there are now three pupils less per classroom in the public schools than there were 10 years ago. Has this reduced the complaints about shortages? Of course not. We just lifted "standards." The number of public welfare employees jumped 61 percent in the past decade while the number of recipients rose only 34 More welfare employees were aupercent. thorized when Congress and State legislatures were promised that added staff would be able to "get people off the rolls" and make them self-supporting. What happened then? The population under 18 years increased by 27 percent, the number of families with a cash income under \$3,000 (in constant 1964 dollars) fell by almost 3 million (from 27 percent of all families to 18 percent) but the number of children on the AFDC rolls doubled.

Freeways are jammed and curb parking is filled up for miles around. This will continue no matter how much we spend on road construction as long as government lets drivers use freeways that cost up to \$23 million a mile without a direct charge and permits them to occupy precious street space for free or cheap storage instead of reserving it for moving traffic. If a department store marks desirable merchandise down to half price or gives it away, it will be mobbed and soon run out of goods. So will government. What would happen if gas or electricity were supplied as freeways are? Probably just what happened to water in New York where it is unmetered.

Of course, many public services cannot be charged to the user. But if they are financed at the local level, there is at least a semblance of a market test to balance desire for services with their tax cost. If the bill can be passed on to the national treasury, there will be no limit to demand.

Need for free public services is like greyhounds chasing a mechanical hare. No chance of catching up—ever. Demand will always be far ahead of supply because socalled standards will be pushed up as soon as performance approaches old standards.

As we tend to move away from the test of the market and the judgment of the community we are increasingly left in a stormtossed sea without compass or anchor. If we leave it to those who are experts in or committed to a particular problem or function to judge how much we ought to spend on the object of their concern, we wind up in chaos. If we let special interest groups or local areas decide how much they get from the national treasury, we invite political logrolling. And if we turn it over to men who have much to gain from added spending but need take no responsibility for facing the bill, we reap extravagance and inflation.

It is unfortunate that there are few objective and firm tests of how much needs to be spent on a public service and even fewer gages by which we can measure its results within a reasonable time. Cost-benefit ratios are largely hypothetical (you get the answer you put in), almost always highly controversial, and useful only in few fields. Govern-

ment lacks the impartial yardsticks which business applies to judge new projects and measure results. If government had produced the Edsel, it would still be making it—turning out huge quantities and giving them away below cost.

There is no automatic shutoff valve or circuitbreaker in government. Rather, the process seems like an endless spiral. As taxes go up taxpayers depend more heavily on government for services and feel more entitled to demand them. And as services

are added, taxes go up again.

Over the span of American history much of the public task, of functions that required broad participation or couldn't pay their way, was accomplished by voluntary action, as Richard Cornuelle recently reminded us in an inspired book, "Reclaiming the American Dream." Civic initiative and performance have a proud and indeed unique record and retain a vast potential. But increasingly, publicly controlled programs have been not supplementing but supplanting voluntary action, hiring away its best talent, discouraging its supporters, quenching their enthusiasm, and threatening to dry up its support.

It may be hard to fight city hall but even tougher to compete with billions from the State capitals or Washington. Former University of Chicago Chancellor Lawrence A. Kimpton said some years ago: "It is hard to market a product at a fair price when some-body down the street is giving it away." Enrollment in higher education was evenly divided between public and private colleges not so long ago. At present trends private institutions will be lucky within a few years to enroll 20 percent of the students. That will mean a far heavier burden on taxpayers and a narrow choice (if any) for students. Will this advance the cause of education?

That government is engaged in many activities which are eminently beneficial, no reasonable man will deny. But in too many of its pursuits we must ask government: "Are you helping to solve the problem or are you part of the problem? Are you working toward a solution or are you making the problem insoluble and permanent?"

A faulty governmental program that does not involve the spending of huge amounts is remediable. When prohibition tried to solve a grave problem by a direct approach and turned out to be a cure worse than the disease, it was repealed. But it is well nigh impossible to abolish a big spending program. Its protagonists or recipients will deny that it has failed and explain results which did not come up to promises as the consequence of insufficient funding and inadequate time. According to its spokesmen there is nothing ever wrong with a public program that could not be corrected by doubling appropriation and staff, extending coverage and territory, or boosting salaries.

If consistent failure over many years would lead to corrective action, the farm support program would long have gone into limbo. It has not solved the problem of surpluses and low farm income and burdens the consumer and taxpayer twice: by higher food

costs and by higher taxes.

At the rate at which we are going, the U.S. Government will within a few years have poured the astronomical sum of \$100 billion into farm price supports. But we are farther from a solution than ever and in spite of all attempts at control, had another record farm crop last year. Suggestions by the country's largest farm organization that Government prepare to get out of the program and ease into a free market are being coldshouldered.

It has been proven time and again that Government by setting a price above the market creates a surplus and by mandating a price below the market, whether on publicly supplied or privately produced goods and services, creates a shortage. If a store undertakes to sell \$1 bills for 50 cents, it will

soon run out of them and if it tries to sell them for \$2, it will keep them forever. That's why we have a shortage of driving and parking space, as I mentioned earlier, and why we have a surplus and unemployment of low-skilled workers whose wage rates are set by Government above the market and above their productive capacity. A further raise in minimum wages will condemn added people to perpetual unemployment and subsistence on the dole. And the farm price support program goes on and grows—while Government builds more big dams to supply farmers with irrigation water at a fraction of its

cost—to grow more crops.

When the Social Security Act was proposed, 30 years ago, Congress and the public were told that old age and survivors and unemployment insurance would slowly but surely diminish the need for the dole (whose ill effects President Roosevelt decried), that it would reduce crime and juvenile delinquency, illegitimacy, family break-up and numerous other social ills. Coverage and benefits were later expanded several times, disability insurance was added, but public assistance rolls kept growing at a rapid rate through periods of rising income—as did the rates of crime, juvenile delinquency, illegitimacy, desertion, and the other evils which the welfare programs were supposed to cure or at least improve. That may have been no mere coincidence.

To be sure, social insurance has proven its worth and, in my opinion, ought to be expanded. But the federally directed public assistance program, judging by its results, is one of the worst failures among our governmental services. Suggestions to offer physically able persons work relief instead of a dole are being as strongly resisted as ever.

The urban renewal program is another example of misdirected governmental action. In a speech on May 27, 1962, New York Mayor Robert F. Wagner recognized this frankly:

"Once upon a time, we thought that if we could just bulldoze the slums and build shiny new public housing for low-income people, all social problems involving these people would virtually disappear. This has turned out to be not so.

"Once we thought that if we built enough playgrounds and other recreational facilities, juvenile delinquency would disappear. This turned out to be not so.

"Once we thought that having discovered a magic bullet to kill the micro-organisms that cause venereal disease, we had conquered venereal disease. That turned out to be not so.

"In these and many other instances, we solved one problem and uncovered two others."

Too often, well-intentioned governmental action did not just uncover two new problems for an old one. It created them.

Slightly over a year ago Martin Anderson in a penetrating analysis "The Federal Bull-dozer" demonstrated the failure of the slum clearance program. In 13 years it destroyed more than four times as many dwellings as it constructed. Moreover, 9 out of every 10 of the new apartments were beyond the reach of the poverty families whose housing had been torn down. Civil rights groups now call it the "Negro removal program." Anderson concluded that the question is not whether urban renewal could be or should be revised. He suggested that it should be abolished because the promises held out for it proved to be a mirage, and the job could more effectively be done by private action.

A few weeks ago University of California Sociologist Nathan Glazer wrote that building new houses won't solve the slum problem because "the slums of any city will tend to equal the number of people defined as social problems, regardless of the quality of design and construction." But does anybody

believe that the urban renewal program will go anywhere but up—now that a newly created Cabinet Department can more effectively promote it?

The plight of the cities is coming in for growing attention and Life magazine devoted a double issue to the subject 2 weeks ago. It defined the cities' primary problems as money and jurisdiction. But money troubles-growing demand for public services and an inadequate tax base--are only symptoms of the disease; they are its result, not The middle and upper income classes which historically provided the cities' economic base and resources as well as civic leadership have been engaged in a mass exodus and are being replaced by new residents who have little to offer in support, contributions or leadership but need and demand vastly expanded public services. trend seems to be intensifying and brews more trouble for cities in the years ahead.

The flight from the cities is not necessarily a natural phenomenon like the weather or earthquakes. It is of course partly due to rising affluence. But to a large extent it can be traced to perverse public policies. To be sure, city policies are not designed with the intent or for the purpose of driving out the higher and middle class families and attracting the poor—but they could not be much different if they were. Some of those policies are the result of Federal influence or commands. Many are citymade. So, people vote with their feet—to escape to a more congenial jurisdiction from a government whose course of action they found to be beyond their power to influence.

There is no sign that cities are about to adopt policies designed to reverse the trend of migration—to attract middle and upper income families and to discourage low income families from coming in and taking over. Nor are they likely to, as long as the National Government pays the greater share of public welfare and defrays 90 percent of the cost of freeways which make it easier and cheaper to commute to city jobs from distant suburbs. And because underpriced expressways bankrupt commuter railroads, the Federal Treasury is now starting to subsidize the building of rapid transit lines.

To abolish poverty is a noble idea but certainly no new idea. The American people have long been engaged in the most effective antipoverty program the world has ever seen. They changed the historical distribution of income from a pyramid to the shape of a pear or diamond. Between 1929 and 1963 the number of households with an income under \$2,000 a year (1963) declined from 30 percent of all families to 11 percent; of those under \$4,000 income, from 68 percent to 29 percent. But though some tried, nobody has yet succeeded in eliminating the lowest 20 percent from the statistical tables.

A few billion dollars of public money would indeed be a cheap price to pay for a program that can wipe out poverty in our midst within a few years, or within our lifetime. But what proof is there that it can? It is yet too early to judge the results of the new antipoverty program. But already the major agencies administering it, the Economic Opportunity and the Office of Office of Education, find themselves engaged in campaigns all over the country to overcome the objections of mayors, boards of education, and communities. The mayors are of course not opposed to getting Federal money and spending it. They agree with the program's major goals but not with its methods. The Federal agencies succeed in breaking down resistance only by using their power to hand out or deny several billions of Federal money—an argument to which every elected official must sooner or later submit. It is apparent that State and local authorities would not apply their own tax funds to the type of program now instituted if compliance were not a condition for getting a share of the Federal money.

The theory that underlies the present Federal programs is that poverty is a deficiency which is bound to perpetuate itself through generations unless eradicated by governmental action of the type now being initiated. If that hypothesis were true, most of America's 194 million residents would still be poor, ignorant and unemployed, as their ancestors were when they landed on these shores. It seems to me that the history of the United States, of our strong mobility upward and downward, stands as living proof of the fundamental error in this theory. American record suggests that the condition of poverty is not so much a cause but a result, and that it can best be remedied in cases where it can be remedied-by the individual.

Undoubtedly, certain of the new programs will help some of their participants to overcome handicaps and to improve their productive capacity. But they may also be sowing the seeds of social ills worse than those they set out to cure. One thing seems certain; that the antipoverty program accelerates the trend toward monolithic government in the United States.

BIG GOVERNMENT AND CENTRALIZATION OF POWER

In establishing a federal structure with an intricate system of checks and balances the Founding Fathers aimed to disperse authority so widely that no one branch or level of government and above all, no one man, could prevail over the others. They concluded from history that concentration of power corrupts and sooner or later leads to abuse and tyranny.

We all know that within our lifetime-of the older generation, that is-an unprecedented transfer of power took place which tremendously strengthened the hand of the National Government and particularly of the President. The most potent factor in this shift was the growth of Federal grants-in-aid which now total over \$14 billion. Through over 200 authorizations they give Federal agencies the deciding voice in most public services which used to be determined and run by State legislatures, city councils, school boards and by the communities themselves. The issue is not that of historical States rights. It is an issue of individual rights because freedom is indivisible. A central government that holds sway over local governments also holds sway over individuals. Most residents of the United States are now dependent upon the National Government in some form-for wages, promotions, grants. subsidies, orders, or pensions—or are subject to favors or harassment by regulatory or tax enforcement agencies. Few can afford any longer to voice objections to Presidential policies or commands (euphemistically called voluntary guidelines) or dare stand up for their rights. Enforced consensus and conformity have become the rule because the penalty for deviation is too severe.

As long as we maintain local diversity, citizens who find themselves in the minority in their home areas can move to jurisdictions whose policies or governments they prefer. When uniformity is imposed, the individual's choice and the right of communities to exercise home rule and local autonomy end.

The multiplication of Federal grants had led to a vertical functional autocracy of the Washington bureaucracy which supersedes the self-government of local areas that used to characterize the American scene. If grants were intended to aid States and local governments, as is often asserted, they could be given without conditions, to be spent at the discretion of local authorities. That was in fact proposed in 1964 by Walter Heller when he was Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. But the Heller plan was quickly killed because Federal agencies

would not have been able to control the actions of States, counties, cities, or school boards. Other proposals, of allocating certain Federal taxes to States or local governments or to permit tax credits for State and local taxes, suffered the same fate, and for the same reason.

Big government means concentration of power in the hands of the Central Government with all the consequences which such a power monopoly implies.

BIG GOVERNMENT AND SECURITY

Adequate protection of the lives and safety of its citizens is government's first and foremost commitment. For this reason the United States devotes bigger resources to national defense than to any other single public function. But the share of defense has been falling and of last account totaled only 30 percent of all government expenditures, as I mentioned earlier. It was this decline that enabled domestic services of government to stage a dramatic expansion over the past 20 years. The question is: What came first? What was the controlling consideration in the changed allocation of public funds?

In a carefully documented study of postwar budget formation, Samuel P. Huntington of the Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University, found:

"In both the Truman administration before the Korean war and in the Eisenhower administration after the war, the tendency was:

"1. To estimate the revenues of the Government or total expenditures possible within the existing debt limit;

"2. To deduct from this figure the estimated cost of domestic programs and foreign aid; and

"3. To allocate the remainder to the military."

This suggests that defense was allocated whatever money was left after everybody else got his share.

More recently, however, the Department of Defense has been acting as its own budget cutter—in contrast to other agencies which fight hard for the highest possible appropriations. At the 1964 National Tax Conference a high Defense Department official ² answered a charge that Federal agencies were pushing for expansion:

"Oddly enough, the bureaucrats in Washington, certainly in the Defense Department, are the ones that are trying to hold down Government expenditures in the appropriation of funds. In the last few years—and this extends into the Eisenhower administration and even into the Truman administration—we've had to fend off additional moneys voted by the Congress for particular projects.

"So we're put under pressure from all sources: from the Congress, from the public, from interested associations to spend more money and I think on balance we resist more than we yield."

That would be all to the good if our national security position versus potential agressors, that is, forces which would destroy us if given a chance, had improved in the period since World War II and if our relative defensive strength had grown in recent years. But those propositions are highly doubtful, to say the least.

The Soviet Union devotes twice as large a share of gross national product to national defense as the United States, as Timothey Sosnovy, Soviet economy specialist at the Library of Congress, has pointed out and the threat from Red China is growing every year. Communist countries have vastly expanded their territory and population, their economic, technological and military power over the past 20 years, and they have been

able to raise their status and influence in the rest of the world and make our position more vulnerable or at least more difficult.

The rapid dismantling of our Armed Forces after World War II invited the Communist takeover of Eastern Europe and large sections of Asia. Aggression in Korea, Vietnam, and other places was not unrelated to our seeming unpreparedness. In Korea our troops were almost pushed into the sea and the United States, for the first time in its history, had to settle for a draw. In Vietnam we have for some years now been unable to cope with a seemingly far inferior opponent.

The number of military projects or programs scrapped, deferred, or slowed down in recent years is in the hundreds. They were not discarded because military experts doubted their value or effectiveness in strengthening our defenses. The decisions fell against the military because the expansion of domestic services was deemed more urgent by the powers that be.

The Skybolt air-to-ground missile, nuclear rocket Rover, manned space glider Dyna Soar, Pluto ram jet rocket engine and numerous other projects were turned down although the leaders of our Armed Forces demanded them. Approval of nuclear carriers was denied and authorization of manned (followon) bombers too long delayed.

A fallout shelter program which could save millions of lives and might deter a would-be aggressor was deemed to be too expensive as was an effective anti-missile-missile system. A few months ago the Nike X missile seemed to be on the verge of approval. When escalation in Vietnam called for larger funds, were offsetting savings to be made by tightening up on civilian type services? Not at all. The Nike X antimissile missile and other defense projects fell victim to budget cutting. Again, as in earlier years, the armed services—domestic welfare programs. The consequences of such policy are awesome to contemplate.

Potentially more critical to national security than money are the time, attention, and efforts of our governmental leaders which are now overwhelmingly spent on domestic affairs. Inadequate study and consideration may have been responsible for the Bay of Pigs disaster and for many other troubles which flare up from time to time in distant parts of the world.

"Congress Needs Help" was the title of a recent investigation and TV review of the inability of "absurdly overworked" Congressmen to be adequately informed on the vital issues they are called upon to decide. Members of Congress cannot give sufficient time, study, and thought to defense and international affairs because they are overloaded with civilian projects. The President, according to the a Newsweek story of December 20, 1965, explained that in 1965 he had concentrated on civilian affairs "to get the domestic problems out of the way so that I could give more time to foreign problems." Some may regard this to be the wrong order of priority. In this day and age a President might conceivably be so occupied with our national security that he could not devote most of his time to pushing the expansion of domestic public services.

Our safety at home is no better protected than our security abroad. In fact, it may be less so. An American, or a local resident, can walk the streets of most major foreign cities without fear, even at night. But that may not be advisable in some residential neighborhoods of Washington, Chicago, and other metropolitan centers. The failure of government to safeguard its citizens is now so widely recognized that a book "How To Protect Yourself on the Streets and in Your Home" (accompanied by a letter from the head of the FBI) seems to be on the way to

becoming a bestseller. (This may be an interesting reverse shift in responsibility: from

government to the individual.)
The United States, the country w

The United States, the country with the highest standards of living, is also the world's most crime ridden. The most powerful Nation which once set out to make the world safe for democracy seems unable or unwilling to make its city streets safe for walking home at night. Crime is rising six times as fast as the population according to the latest FBI report.

There is only one possible explanation for this phenomenon: we have not been able to convince would-be offenders that "crime doesn't pay." They expect to get away with it. And they may well have concluded from a study of reports on crimes, arrests, convictions and terms actually served, that the statistical odds are not too discouraging.

It is obvious that governmental action in combating and suppressing crime is woefully inadequate. But so far not enough has been done about it—nor about the fact that almost 50,000 men and women are killed each year in traffic accidents, largely because governmental attention and effort are preoc-

cupied with other pursuits.

In conclusion: Government has multiplied its domestic activities in recent decades, making a steadily growing number of Americans dependent upon its benefits and favors, extending the area of coercion, while not adequately meeting its responsibility to protect the safety of the Nation and the individual. That course, if pursued much longer, gravely threatens personal and collective liberty and security. It is high time for us to quit devising new programs which Government may adopt or enlarge as substitutes for personal effort and to start thinking of means to strengthen the challenge to the individual to deal with his own problems.

Government can be and should be man's best friend—and it is, if it fulfills its primary tasks well. To the extent to which it neglects its foremost duties in order to expand recklessly in other directions and harms the body politic, it becomes a foe and should, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, be altered. The time has not come when we can afford to abolish it.

DOLLAR BLOCKADE OF CUBA NEEDED

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the United States to declare a dollar blockade of Cuba so that American taxpayer funds do not contribute to the export of Communist subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere. I make this suggestion after observing plans by the United Nations to provide Cuba with over \$3 million in special funds for the University of Havana and an agricultural research station. Please keep in mind that the United States contributes 40 percent of the funds used by that U.N. special agency.

It means that \$1.2 million of U.S. money would be used in the project. And what do they teach at Havana "U"? More subversion of the hemisphere, of course, because the university branch to be helped is headed by Russian and Cuban military personuel.

¹Henry E. Glass, Economic Adviser to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

Brazil and Paraguay have strongly objected to helping Castro through the U.N., and for good reason. Brazil and Paraguay are both principal targets of Communist subversion directed from Cuba. Just last month the Communist tricontinental congress on subversion was held in Cuba and was formally designated as the headquarters of Communist subversion in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. If we contribute funds to this unwarranted U.N. project we will be underwriting that subversion.

A similar effort to provide U.N. funds for Castro's Cuba was scrapped 3 years ago due to protests from many of us in the Congress. Apparently the planners do not give up easily, but my opposition to such a scheme remains just as strong.

I was dismayed by the published reports of the official U.S. attitude toward such assistance to Cuba as stated by U.N. Ambassador Roosevelt. He says the United States will register an objection on principle, but will not withhold our share of the fund or demand rejection of the proposal. This is bureaucratic doubletalk of the worst order. It is inconceivable that any government can be against something as frightening as communism and still support it.

Mr. Speaker it is hoped that public and congressional indignation will defeat this latest proposal as it did 3 years ago.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, would like to join my colleagues in offering congratulations to the freedom-loving people of Estonia and her many sons and daughters in America as they observe February 24 as the anniversary of Estonia's declaration of independence. It is sincerely hoped that the encouragement and good wishes expressed by many today will serve to further inspire the Estonian people to resist communism.

The fact that modern Estonia has been under the heel of the U.S.S.R. continually since 1944 and has not succumbed to Soviet pressures to accept communism is a truly remarkable accomplishment.

Today I would like to call attention to one particular argument to which the Communists like to refer, namely, the allegation that since membership in the Soviet Union, Estonia's industrial expansion has increased. What is not said and what we should remember is that before the U.S.S.R. captured Estonia in 1944 the country had substantial industries of its

The Soviets applied enormous pressures and exercised almost inhuman cruelty against the people to increase industrial output. Furthermore, this was done at the expense of providing consumer goods and a program for increasing the living standards of the Estonian people, areas in which the Soviets exercised almost total disinterest. It is estimated by competent authorities that the Estonian people are materially in worse condition today than they were 25 years ago.

It is conditions like these to which the free world must address itself in shedding light on actual conditions of the millions of people held captive by U.S.S.R. Our continued observance of the historic declaration of independence on February 24, 1918, is an indication to all the world that Estonia's plight is of concern to us and that we are committed to her liberty.

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM SUPPORTS A STRONG VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Young Americans for Freedom—YAF—has been recognized as the leading student organization in the Nation supporting a strong U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam. Practically since its founding in 1960, YAF has been regarded as a highly effective conservative youth organization, and YAF's position on the Vietnam question has given it greater recognition.

It goes without undue comment that I am highly interested in the student developments regarding Vietnam throughout the Nation, but the activities of college students both for and against the U.S. position in Vietnam on the college campuses of the Southern States are of

particular interest to me.

It has been encouraging to learn of student organizations, like YAF, who are supporting a strong U.S. foreign policy. During the past year the student protest demonstrations from the left have grown in proportion, size, number, and volume. It is gratifying to a Member of Congress to hear of responsible student organizations like YAF, the Young Republicans, and even the Young Democrats in some instances, who are not only offsetting the leftwing student protests by having rallies supporting a strong Vietnam policy but who are also launching many constructive programs.

Mr. Speaker, the position of YAF on foreign policy questions is derived from the Sharon statement which was adopted in conference at Sharon, Conn., September 9-11, 1960, at the founding of the organization. In the Sharon statement are found the guidelines for determination of YAF's position on foreign policy questions:

In this time of moral and political crisis, it is the responsibility of the youth of America to affirm certain eternal truths.

We as young conservatives, believe: That we will be free only so long as the national sovereignty of the United States is secure; that history shows periods of free-

dom rare, and can exist only when free citizens concertedly defend their rights against all enemies:

That the forces of international communism are, at present, the greatest single threat to these liberties;

That the United States should stress victory over, rather than coexistence with, this menace; and

That American foreign policy must be judged by this criterion: does it serve the just interests of the United States?

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of serving on the National Advisory Board of YAF along with many distinguished Members of the two Houses. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THUR-MOND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Towerl, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Buchanan], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Abernethy], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broy-HILL, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Dorn], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN AN-DREWS], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Callaway], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Watson], and the gentleman from Mississippi WILLIAMS], serve with me on this Advisory Board. In addition to these Members from the Southern States, there are 30 more Members from the two Houses who also serve on that board.

Mr. Speaker, last fall I had the distinct pleasure of speaking at a testimonial dinner honoring one of the greatest men of the other House, the Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND. This testimonial dinner was held in Birmingham, Ala., a city of fond memories to the Senator.

At this testimonial dinner, the Senator made some pertinent comments regarding the Vietnam question. In part the Senator stated:

On the international scene, you are faced with dangers to freedom from a succession of little wars and the even more dangerous diplomatic remedies to terminate them, as is demonstrated by the events this year in the Dominican Republic, and, I fear, may be soon The miliagain demonstrated in Vietnam. tary action of the Communists in Vietnam is at this point of less peril to freedom than is the potential for concessions to the Communist aggressors which may be granted in the terms of a political termination of the military hostilities.

The Senator went on to comment:

The greatest threat is an idea, or, more precisely, a mental attitude or orientation, even a way of thinking, which is induced by

Mr. Speaker, the Senator concluded his moving address by a challenge to the young people of America which bears directly on the Vietnam issue:

In your own time, however, you are faced with a prevalence of moral and political relativism, which is more extensive, more pervasive and more dangerous than ever before. It is your greatest obstacle in your struggle for freedom. You are the best hope for freedom. You can fulfill your promise if you will but resist moral and political relativism by continuing your disciplined adherence to an absolute code of spiritual and philosophical values. You must continue to refuse to compromise with expediency. You must maintain the courage to defy the consensus. You must continue to choose the harder right instead of the easier wrong.

Young Americans for Freedom, as many other organizations throughout the South, have answered this call.

At the national convention of the organization, commemorating its fifth anniversary, here in the Nation's Capital early last fall, the YAF delegates unanimously passed a resolution calling for the commitment of sufficient number of ground troops to combat the guerillas now active in South Vietnam. YAF applauded the commitment of United States might and prestige on behalf of South Vietnam and supported the recognition that the war must be won on the ground as military success is a precondition for the political and social developments which will ultimately decrease the ability of the Communists to lure peasants into giving aid and comfort to the Vietcong.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Whereas we share the administration's view that what the Communists chose to call "wars of national liberation" constitute nothing more than a new form of aggression which must be resisted as a threat to the establishment of true peace; and

Whereas the current aggression against South Vietnam takes its primary inspiration and direction from the north and has as its ultimate object the conquest of all of southeast Asia, a fact recognized by those countries in the area who have sent significant amounts of combat personnel to share in the burden of defeating the Communists; and

Whereas we believe that this Nation is required by considerations of national interest and by moral considerations of the highest order to come to the aid of the people of South Vietnam and other countries of southeast Asia in their defense against aggression; and

Whereas while South Vietnam fails to measure up to the full standards of freedom to which we in this country have become accustomed, the present form of government nevertheless affords a greater opportunity for the ultimate development of truly liberal institutions than would a Communist regime: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Young Americans for Freedom applauds the commitment of U.S. might and prestige on behalf of South Vietnam and supports the recognition that this war must be won on the ground in South Vietnam as military success is a precondition for the political and social developments which will ultimately decrease the ability of Communist recruiters to lure local peasants into giving aid and comfort to the Vietcong; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the administration demonstrate its intent to take whatever action proves tactically necessary to assure that the successful termination of the war will not be unduly delayed, including such measures as (a) the commitment of sufficient numbers of ground troups to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam, (b) effective air action against Soviet-built missile sites around Hanoi and Haiphong, (c) the beginning, by calculated aerial and naval bombardment, of the destruction of the industrial capacity of North Vietnam, (d) by instituting a naval and air blockade of North Vietnam, all of these steps to be taken to

induce North Vietnam to cease in its support of the troops in the south, and (e) the clear communication to Communist China that any overt intervention by that country will result in retaliation by the United States and by our allies such as Nationalist China.

YAF's activities in the Southern States have followed a well-designed pattern of constructive action. In Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, and Virginia, YAF chapters have engaged in constructive activities supporting the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, a news article in the Wednesday, October 27, 1965, edition of the Durham, N.C., Sun, entitled, "Leader in YAF Hits Protesters," illustrates the attitude of YAF toward the leftwing protest demonstrations. The article follows:

LEADER IN YAF HITS PROTESTERS

Washington.—A leader of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) blasted the student anti-Vietnam protests here in the Nation's capital today as a deliberate attempt to defeat the cause of freedom in Asia and the world.

In making the denouncement, Randal C. Teague, a member of YAF's board of directors and the leader of its southern program, said, "Students who are burning their draft cards and organizing programs to avoid the draft and to thwart the American effort against communism in Asia are in a minority on the college campus. What they are doing is wrong—legally and morally. Those who are in violation of Federal laws shoud be prosecuted and severely punished by the courts."

Teague, a student himself, went on to say, "These students are not conscientious objectors. Their actions show shades of absolute anarchy. As many national leaders have pointed out, there is strong evidence that many of these protests have been led by the extremists of the radical left who often associate themselves with Communistleaning groups. Responsible students have no sympathy with those who are deliberately flaunting the law by burning their draft cards, by blocking troop and supply convoys, and worst of all, by demoralizing those valiant fighting men in Vietnam today who are risking their lives to insure the security of freemen."

The YAF leader concluded by saying, "When our Nation issues a call to arms, it is our duty to respond to it, whether we personally like it or not. Every American, from the youngest to the oldest, deserves to support his Government in time of national emergency, and surely the war in Vietnam is one of the gravest situations confronting the world today."

At its recent national convention in Washington, YAF passed a strong resolution unanimously calling for the commitment of sufficient numbers of ground troops to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam. The resolution also called for effective air action against Soviet-built missile sites around Hanoi and Halphong, the beginning by calculated aerial and naval bombardment of the destruction of the industrial capacity of North Vietnam, and by the institution of naval and air blockade of North Vietnam. The resolution concluded with the call to issue a clear communication to Communist China that any overt intervention by that country will result in retaliation by the United States and by our allies.

In a telegram dated November 1, 1965, the Southern region of YAF called upon the Attorney General of the United States to prosecute violators of Federal

draft statutes. The text of the telegram follows:

Hon. Nicholas BeB. Katzenbach, Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

The Southern region of Young Americans for Freedom representing thousands of responsible college students strongly supports Justice Department efforts to prosecute violators of Federal draft statutes. These violators must be prosecuted if respect for law and order is to prevail. We urge full execution of Public Law 89-152 against all draft card We commend efforts to prosecute burners. those deliberately disrupting the American war effort. While we support the right to peaceful protests, we cannot condone riotous demonstrations. In our opinion many of the recent protests border on sedition and treason. We support a strong administration policy on winning the war at home as well as abroad.

> RANDAL C. TEAGUE, Regional Director.

Mr. Speaker, an appropriate release to the newspapers, radio, and television media was issued subsequent to this telegram to make clear to the public the position of YAF on the draft-card burners. I ask unanimous consent that this release may appear in the RECORD at this point.

STUDENT LEADER ASKS KATZENBACH TO PROSECUTE DRAFT VIOLATORS—NOVEMBER 1, 1965

Washington.—A southern student leader today supported the Justice Department in arresting and prosecuting violators of Federal draft laws.

Randal C. Teague, a national board of directors member of Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) and its southern spokesman, advised Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach in a telegram today that "the southern region of YAF, representing thousands of responsible college students, strongly supports Justice Department efforts to prosecute violators of Federal draft statutes."

Teague went on to say, "These violators must be prosecuted if respect for law and order is to prevail. We urge full execution of Public Law 89–152 against all draft-card violators." Public Law 89–152 is the law carrying a fine of \$10,000 or 5 years' imprisonment, or both, for any person who knowingly destroys or mutilates his draft card. The law was enacted to carry a severe penalty against the draft-card burners at recent student demonstrations against U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

The telegram concluded, "We commend efforts to prosecute those deliberately disrupting the American war effort. While we support the right to peaceful protests, we cannot condone riotous demonstrations. In our opinion, many of the recent protests border on sedition and treason. We support a strong administration policy on winning the war at home as well as abroad."

YAF is regarded as the leading student group supporting a strong policy in Vietnam. Its national chairman, Tom Huston, of Indiana, appeared on ABC's "Issues and Answers" this past Sunday to present the opinion of students supporting a strong U.S. policy in Asia.

YAF has a southernwide program of donating blood to American soldiers in Vietnam, aiding refugees and orphans fleeing from war-torn North Vietnam, sending mail to our American soldiers, praising them, to let them know the majority of American students are behind them, a petition campaign in support of a strong administration policy, and the presentation of debates and speeches on Vietnam on various campuses.

During my recent tour of South Vietnam and southeast Asia, one of the problems of the war which struck me most clearly was the lack of sufficient material support from our allies in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and from our allies throughout the free world. While the Republic of South Korea and the Australian Government have sent troops to South Vietnam, the remainder of the free nations of Asia or the free world have contributed little to winning this war against aggression. Unfortunately, Allied support is far from being at the level required to sustain the effort.

YAF realized this shortcoming in our foreign policy efforts, and in an attempt to inform the American people, on and off the college campus, of this inadequacy, the southern offices issued a call for more Allied support in Vietnam. This release follows:

STUDENT GROUP CALLS FOR ALLIED SUPPORT IN VIETNAM—NOVEMBER 8, 1965

Washington.—The southern spokesman of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) called for greater military and economic support in Vietnam from our allies today. Randal C. Teague, a student at the American University in the Nation's Capital, called for expanded assistance to win the war in Vietnam from our allies in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and from throughout the free world.

In making the pronouncement, Teague said, "Since 1961, the United States has borne the burden alone of defending South Vietnam and its people. Not only the security of all Asia but ultimately the security of all nations will depend on the outcome of this war. It is time that our allies help the United States win the war. Mere moral support is not enough."

Teague went on to say, "We not only need more fighting men and materials, but winning the war in Vietnam will require greater commitments of medical corpsmen to doctor the civilians, schoolteachers to educate the children, engineers and construction teams to build roads and hospitals, and agricultural experts to increase food production. We must win the war with the people, and our allies are surely in a position to supply the technicians required to help the people."

He concluded by saying, "President Johnson and the administration should not only encourage our allies to help us secure the freedom of South Vietnam because of Communist China's continual threat to Asia, but they should also encourage our allies to stop trading and shipping with Communist China and North Vietnam. Our American soldiers are being shot at and killed by North Vietnamese soldiers whose nation is being economically aided by our allies. It just doesn't make sense."

With the exception of troop commitments from South Korea and Australia, very little assistance has come from our allies.

YAF is regarded as one of the leading student organizations backing a strong policy in Vietnam. The student group has launched programs on college campuses in the Southern States to donate blood to American fighting men, to collect food and clothing for refugees fleeing war-torn North Vietnam, to have fraternities and sororities adopt Vietnamese orphans, and to offset the student protest demonstrations.

One of the problems in the college movement in this Nation in support of a strong administration policy has been proper coordination of activities. When blood donation drives, petition campaigns, debates, speeches, and many other actions are going on simultaneously across the Nation and throughout the South, it is difficult to get across to the American people that these actions are more significant and more representative of true student opinion than the one-shot protest demonstrations led by the radical left.

In order to obtain the needed coordination throughout the Southern States, Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., is sponsoring the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee—SSVVC—which is calling upon the support of all campus organizations supporting a strong policy. They have called upon support from the College Young Republican clubs, the Young Democratic clubs, YAF chapters, and any other independent or affiliated group.

The purposes of SSVVC were outlined in a release of November 23, 1965, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the RECORD at this point.

SOUTHERN STUDENT VICTORY IN VIETNAM COMMITTEE FORMED—NOVEMBER 23, 1965

Washington.—The formation of the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee—SSVVC—to support a strong U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam by the demonstration of student support was announced here in the Nation's Capital today. The new committee will operate on over a hundred college campuses in eight States of the South.

The committee's formation was announced by Randal C. Teague, the southern spokes-man for the Young Americans for Freedom, Inc. (YAF), a conservative youth group, and Alfred Regnery, the national director of the recently held symposium for freedom in Vietnam and YAF's national college director.

In announcing the formation of SSVVC, Teague, who is its southernwide field director, said, "We seek the earnest support and cooperation of all college students and organizations who are supporting a firm policy in southeast Asia. We will serve as the principal vehicle through which all student activities in support of the U.S. policy in South Vietnam can be channeled. We call for the support and cooperation from the college Young Republican clubs, the Young Democratic clubs, the YAF chapters, and any other student organization, affiliated or independent, which seeks victory in Vietnam."

Teague, a student at the American University in Washington, D.C., went on to say, "Much student activity has already been going on in the South, but during the next year this activity will greatly increase. It is not only desirable, but essential, that these activities be properly coordinated. SSVVC is such a coordinating unit."

SSVVC will undertake programs on college campuses to sponsor debaters and speakers on over 50 college campuses; to sponsor blood donation drives to give blood for American fighting men in South Vietnam; to form local Victory in Vietnam Committees on 107 campuses which serve as target sights; to send food and clothing to refugees and orphans fleeing North Vietnam; to have college fraternities and sororities adopt orphan children in Vietnam; to circulate petitions calling for a strong foreign policy position in southeast Asia; and several other constructive programs.

SSVVC and its cooperating groups will participate closely with the International Youth Crusade for Freedom in Vietnam with debate-in's on December 7 and student rallies supporting the war effort on January 7 and 8 of next year. YAF leaders are challenging members of leftwing student protest groups which have been instrumental in the burning of draft cards to debates on December 7, the anniversary of Pearl Harbor attack. Major rallies have been planned for January throughout the world.

In addition to Teague and Regnery, the steering committee of SSVVC will be composed of the field directors for each State within the jurisdiction of the new committee. The steering committee's membership was announced as Judy Whorton, a student at Samford University in Birmingham; Timothy C. Ohr, a student at St. Petersburg, Fia., Junior College; Guy W. Mayes, Jr., a student at Emory University in Atlanta; James E. Green, a student at Duke University in Durham, N.C.; Charles C. Hooks, Jr., a recent graduate of the University of North Carolina now residing in Gaffney, S.C.; Michael Everhart, a student at Southwestern at Memphis; and Thomas B. Wright, Jr., a student at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va.

An indication of the substantial public support which the SSVVC received is an editorial which appeared in the Clearwater, Fla., Sun of Monday, December 6, 1965. This editorial follows:

PROTESTING THE PROTESTERS

With the activities of the right-leaning Young Americans for Freedom most middle-of-the-roaders cannot always see eye to eye, but with the latest YAF project few can take exception—their creation of the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee.

The newest YAF project thus becomes part of a growing national protest against the draft dodgers, draft card burners, and peace demonstrators.

As announced by Randall C. Teague, a former Pinellas County resident and now a student at the American University in Washington, D.C., the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee has been organized to support a strong U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam, and will operate on a hundred college campuses in this country.

Teague details the aims of the new youth movement:

"We seek the earnest support and cooperation of all college students and organizations who are supporting a firm policy in southeast Asia. We will serve as the principal vehicle through which all student activities in support of the U.S. policy in South Vietnam can be channeled. We call for the support and cooperation from the college Young Republican Clubs, the Young Democratic Clubs, the YAF chapters, and any other student organization, affiliated or independent, which seeks victory in Vietnam."

ent, which seeks victory in Vietnam."

Some of the projects of the SSVVC, reports Teague, will be to undertake programs on college campuses, sponsoring debates and speakers; to sponsor blood donation drives to give blood for American fighting men in South Vietnam; to form local Vietory in Vietnam Committees on 107 campuses; to send food and clothing to refugees and orphans fleeing North Vietnam; to have college fraternities and sororities "adopt" orphan children in Vietnam; to circulate petitions calling for a strong policy position in southeast Asia.

Tomorrow, the 24th anniversary of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, will find the new group participating with the International Youth Crusade for Freedom for Vietnam with debates with leftwing student protest groups which have been instrumental in the burning of draft cards.

We welcome YAF to the fast-growing ranks of young people and Americans generally

a tal tri

who are getting plenty fed up with this leftwing lunatic fringe, and who are letting our servicemen in Vietnam know in no uncertain terms that we are behind them all the way.

Mr. Speaker, the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee has been successful. Civic support of the campus program, as indicated in the Clearwater Sun article, has come from every area of the South.

At a regional conference of YAF's State officers for the Southern region, held in Atlanta on February 12, new Vietnam-related programs were formulated to spearhead an even larger program to support a strong policy in Vietnam.

YAF has been cautious in handling the Vietnamese situation. They are supporting a strong policy—not just an administration policy. They are prepared to deviate from the policy of any administration when that policy does not coincide with the necessary action required to sustain the war against Communist aggression. YAF has been and will continue to be, I am sure, committed to an administration policy only so long as that policy is consistent with that criterion set forth in the Sharon statement for determining American foreign policy: does it serve the just interests of the United States?

HORTON URGES REDEDICATION TO LIBERATION OF ESTONIA

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the observance by our fellow Americans of Estonia's 48th anniversary of its declaration of independence is a fitting tribute to the Estonian people. The hope is ever present that through commemorating this event of Estonian history, those Estonians now held captive and in virtual slavery by the Russian Communists will continue to be inspired to resist Russian efforts to make them reject their historic cultural heritage.

In man's quest for liberty, few struggles surpass those of Estonian patriots. From Russian occupation between 1721-1918 Estonia not only succeeded in surmounting Russification programs, but Estonian culture actually thrived. During that period even though under Russia's heavy oppressive control, Estonia's music, poetry, plays, and books flourished. A remarkable tribute to a tenacious people. In addition, this period also nurtured Estonian nationalism which showed itself in the Estonian rebellion of 1905. Though Russian soldiers ruthlessly crushed the revolt, the spark of nationalism still burned and emerged again in 1917-18.

Under Russia's provisional government of 1917, autonomy was granted to Estonia. She was given the right to elect a parliament and administer her

own laws. German successes in pushing Russian troops out of much of the Baltic area encouraged the Estonian Government to proclaim Estonia an independent state. That declaration was issued on February 24, 1918, and for the next 2 years the fledgling nation was forced to fight both Germans and Russians in order to preserve its independence. Finally on February 2, 1920, the Communists signed a treaty in which all previous claims over Estonian territory were renounced.

The next 20 years were busily spent on improving the domestic situation, but the Estonian people kept a constant vigil on Russian intentions. That policy was well founded as the infamous Mutual Assistance Treaty of 1939 indicated. The treaty enabled Russian forces to legally occupy Estonian territory. Not content with the treaty provisions, Russia presented Estonia with an ultimatum on June 16, 1940, which capitulation. amounted to complete Through Russian manipulation and intimidation a new Estonian Government amenable to Moscow took over on June 21, 1940. In July this government proclaimed Estonia a Soviet Socialist Republic

From mid-1941 to the end of 1944, nazism replaced Russian terror, murder, and deportation. But unfortunately for the Estonians, World War II's end resulted in the return of Russian occupation and membership in the Soviet Union.

The tragedy and suffering of Estonia's people under Soviet Russia are almost beyond belief. Their ability to endure and continue their own culture in light of Russian occupation and impositions is a truly marvelous feat. But how long can we expect that resistance to continue without more tangible aid from the free world? In an attempt to help alleviate this problem I have sponsored House Concurrent Resolution 290 which would have the President instruct our United Nations representative to initiate action on Russia's forced occupation of the Baltic States.

I know and feel what this day represents to men and women of Estonian origin the world over. I am privileged to represent a large number of these people living in the Rochester, N.Y., area. It is my fervent hope that as Estonians and their millions of supporters in America commemorate Estonia's 48th anniversary they will rededicate themselves to work together for their people's liberation and freedom.

TO IMPROVE THE WEATHER FORE-CASTING SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, southern California has been besieged by the most violent storms in recent history during the past few months and costly damage to private, commercial, and military property has been widespread. Continued interruptions in air and land operations of the military have resulted from sudden storms and the same interferences have caused considerable indisposition to commercial and private traffic as well.

Agricultural operators have suffered greatly from the recent unusual weather conditions and all of these interests may well have fared better if sufficient advance storm warnings had been available. Across the border in Mexico the damage from these storms has been even more devastating and the loss of life, far greater. The region south and southwest of San Diego seems to be the area from which a great many of these violent storms approach. It has long been recognized as a sparse data area for meteorological information, and this fact has recently been confirmed again to me by the Administrator of our Environmental Services Administration. Some information is obtained on an irregular basis through our cooperative program of taking observations by merchant ships and aircraft crews of international flights who report in-flight weather conditions when passing through that region. We also receive some satellite surveillance for the detection of major storms and weather systems.

Our Weather Bureau has, in the past, given consideration to the establishment of a weather station for both surface and upper air observations on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, but the establishment of such a weather station has yet to be accomplished. The exhorbitant financial loss suffered by our Government and our private citizens makes it imperative that the Congress act quickly to authorize the establishment of meteorological observation stations on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States.

Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation aimed at accomplishing this purpose and the text of my bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to improve the weather forecasting service of the United States, the Administrator of the Environmental Science Services Administration shall take such action as may be necessary to establish a meteorological reporting station of Guadalupe Island, Mexico. In taking such action, he shall cooperate with the State Department and other departments and agencies of the United States, with the meteorological service of Mexico, and with the World Meteorological Organization.

FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS ENGAGED IN TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during the 89th Congress I, along with other Members of the House from both political parties, have protested against the self-defeating policy of doing business with foreign-flag vessels which are engaged in trade with North Vietnam. It is exasperating enough to learn that free world trade with North Vietnam has increased about 138 percent since 1955, when the United States first began asking other non-Communist nations to help in exerting economic pressure on that avowed foe of the free world. But it has been downright discouraging to reflect that ships which profited from trade with the United States had a business-as-usual policy with the mortal enemy of American soldiers in Vietnam.

The Department of Commerce has declared that it will deny Governmentfinanced cargoes to foreign-flag vessels which called at North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966. Although this certainly is a step in the right direction, I must agree with the presidents of the International Longshoremen's Union, the National Maritime Union, and the Seafarers International Union that the administration's directive blacklisting ships transporting cargoes to North Vietnam is too weak and ineffective.

Following are details of the regulations as they appeared in the Federal Register of February 12, 1966:

The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate U.S. Government departments the following list of such vessels which arrived in North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966, based on in-formation received through February 10,

Flag of registry, name of ship

British:	tonnage
Shienfoon	7, 127
Shirley Christine	6, 724
Wakasa Bay	7,044
Cypriot: Amon	7, 229
Greek: Agenor	7 139

SEC. 2. Vessels which called at North Vietnam on or after January 25, 1966, may reacquire eligibility to carry U.S. Governmentfinanced cargoes from the United States if the persons who control the vessels give satisfactory certification and assurance:

(a) That such vessels will not, thence-forth, be employed in the North Vietnam trade so long as it remains the policy of the U.S. Government to discourage such trade; and

(b) That no other vessels under their control will thenceforth be employed in the North Vietnam trade, except as provided in paragraph (c), and

(c) That vessels under their control which are covered by contractual obligations, including charters, entered into prior to January 25, 1966, requiring their employment in the North Vietnam trade shall be withdrawn from such trade at the earliest opportunity consistent with such contractual obligations.

NICHOLAS JOHNSON,

Maritime Administrator.

VOLUNTARY WAGE GUIDEPOSTS REFUSED BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY AND HIS COL-LEAGUES

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House must view with considerable concern the refusal of AFL-CIO President George Meany and his colleagues to accept the voluntary wage guideposts proposed by the Council of Economic Advisers for this year.

The idea of guideposts was first put forward in the 1962 Economic Report of the President. At that time President

Kennedy said:

If labor leaders in our major industries will accept the productivity benchmark as a guide to wage objectives, and if management in these industries will practice equivalent restraint in their price decisions, the year ahead will be a brilliant chapter in the record of the responsible exercise of freedom.

Implicit in the late President's remarks was the fear that without this restraint. inflation could nullify whatever economic progress was made. Inflation continues to haunt our economy. With the growing number of people living on fixed incomes in their later years, the danger of inflationary pressures which reduce purchasing power and devalue the dollar is particularly acute. Thus the "productivity benchmark" referred to by President Kennedy must continue to be our standard for wage decisions.

Ideally, we would prefer that Government remain entirely neutral in the decisionmaking process that takes place in the private sector. But we must accept the fact that economic pressure at home and crises around the world demand the careful cooperation of business, labor, and Government.

The proposed guideposts will not guarantee wage-price stability and economic growth, but in my judgment, they represent reasonable standards to guide private decisionmakers in making responsible judgments in the public interest.

The administration should not use these voluntary standards as an excuse for questionable attempts at enforcement. Such recent attempts indicate that we need to review our stockpiling policy. They do not warrant abandonment of the guideposts.

Labor should not set itself above the national interest in sustaining economic growth within a framework of restraint. The times demand responsibility from us all.

A BILL TO INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Skubitz] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, two major specters haunt the American people today-fear of a major war in Asia and the threat of widespread inflation

The sad effects of inflation are especially felt by our senior citizens, most of whom live on fixed incomes either through retirement or on social security. Although the social security check is the same each month, the cost of everything from food to footwear continues to rise at an alarming pace. From 1958 until the most recently enacted increase in social security cash benefits, recipients suffered a 7-percent loss in buying power.

To correct this unfortunate and unnecessary problem, I am introducing a bill today which will provide automatic increases in social security benefits as the cost of living rises. This bill calls for an increase of 3 percent in the benefits whenever the consumer price index reflects a similar jump in the cost of

This method alone among the many proposals for improved benefits can be accomplished without any further increase in social security taxes. According to cost studies by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the growth of the economy will provide the necessary revenues to make the cost-ofliving adjustments proposed in my bill.

In my opinion this is a just and equitable bill that should be passed. have an obligation to fulfill to our elderly constituents, for we have created this hydra-headed monster and the responsibility is ours. After all, much of the cause of our present inflation can be directly attributed to the wild spending programs in which our Government is presently engaged.

Inflation, as we all know, means everything costs more.

While prices are spiraling so are the Social security taxes were taxes boosted with the passage of medicare; excise taxes are being raised back to where they were before and the collection of income taxes is being accelerated. Now the President and his advisers are talking about increasing income taxes even more so that the poor taxpayer is left with less to pay for commodities which cost more.

At the current rate of climb, one-half per cent a month according to the Department of Commerce, the cost of living will go up a highly inflationary 6 percent this year. From the first of last year to the first of this month it rose 4.1 percent, and it looks like it will beat both the Russians and us to the moon. In terms we all understand this means on the average an individual has to lay down \$1.04 on the counter today for what he paid \$1.00 for a little over a year ago, and by the end of this year it will cost a dollar and a dime for what you could get with a dollar last year. Individual items have jumped more than others: bacon has jumped 61 percent in the last 10 years, a man's wool suit has increased 23 percent in price, and a loaf of bread costs 17 percent more.

Until a more responsible attitude toward government spending is assumed and inflation is stopped, we must do whatever we can to protect those who are hurt the most—the ones living on a fixed income, like our social security folks. I hope Congress acts swiftly and favorably upon my proposal to raise benefits as inflation goes up.

EXPORT SURPLUS OR TRADE DEFICIT?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Betts] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, since 1960 the Department of Commerce has been announcing an export surplus year after year, ranging from \$4.5 billion to \$6.9 billion. Recently the 1965 trade surplus was given out as amounting to \$5.2 billion. Although this was still at a high level, it was a decline of \$1.7 billion from the high-water mark of \$6.9 billion in 1964.

These high surplus figures have been used both as a measure of the competitive force of our industries in foreign trade and of the great value of exports to our balance of payments deficit. The amounts reported each year have been set against the cost of foreign aid, tourist expenditures abroad, and so forth, to demonstrate the valuable function of exports and their service in offsetting deficits incurred from other sources.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we have been deluding ourselves and singing high notes of optimism when there was little or nothing to be optimistic about, so far as our trade balance and our competitive standing in the world are concerned.

For one thing, our official export statistics have included all the sales and shipments arising from AID appropriations. In other words, our export reports include goods that we ourselves have paid for out of the Treasury. By this measure it would be easy to double our export surplus. We need do no more than increase foreign aid expenditures sufficiently.

Secondly, we have been reporting our imports at what they cost at the foreign point of shipment, neglecting to add freight and insurance costs incurred in bringing the goods to this country. This is a naive practice and we are one of the few countries that adhere to this method. With respect to imports coming from Europe, Asia, and Africa, this understates the cost by some 25 percent. On imports of \$21.3 billion, which was the level of our 1965 purchases abroad on the basis of foreign value, the undervaluation would be serious. The true figure would be closer to \$25 billion.

If we wash out these two unjustifiable practices from our trade statistics, our export surplus vanishes. This is to say, if we value our imports at their true cost and if we exclude from our exports the goods that we sell, not competitively but because we subsidize them or give them away, we actually incurred a deficit of some \$2 billion in 1965 in our foreign trade.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to be gained by deluding ourselves in this manner. On the other hand, much harm can come from such an odd practice. We generally pride ourselves on basing policies on facts, or trying to do so. Otherwise our judgment loses its value

Why do we then persist in this practice of self-deception? I can think of three reasons that would explain the stubbornness. One is that a large trade surplus would be a great credit to the trade agreements program. It would bear out the predictions made on behalf of the program and the hopes centered in it. It would justify the undertaking by the fruits it had borne.

Not to be overlooked is the reflection that a large export surplus would also put a pleasing sheen on the feverish efforts and motions of the Department of Commerce to promote exports. With no surplus to show for these efforts it might be more difficult to coax more money out of Congress.

The third item is perhaps the most pernicious of the three. The so-called export surplus is used as evidence that the industries of this country are indeed competitive in world markets. Moreover, the high surplus shows that we could absorb further drastic tariff cuts with little risk of damage to our industries.

If the authentic results of our trade demonstrate that we are not really competitive abroad except in two or three products, our trade position takes on a wholly different complexion. The fact is that so far as exports of manufactured goods are concerned we have been experiencing a shrinking in our share compared with other countries. The principal exception is machinery. Our exports of this item have boomed hand in hand with the rising tide of investment of our industries abroad. This may be temporary and may result in shrinking foreign markets for goods shipped from this country in the future. Exports of farm products have also risen to record heights, but this swelling volume is attributable to shipments under Public Law 480, food for peace, and similar programs. They do not reflect an improvement of our competitive position in agricultural products.

It seems unthinkable that under these circumstances we should offer to the world another 50-percent tariff reduction. Recently, Mr. William M. Roth, Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, in a speech before the United States-Japan Trade Council, said:

Actually, much has been accomplished so far in Geneva. Items to be excepted from the across-the-board 50-percent cut in industrial tariffs were tabled in November 1964. Our exceptions were kept at the barest mini-

mum consistent with considerations of overriding national security.

Referring to the so-called Kennedy round he also said:

This ambitious effort, the greatest in the 20-year history of GATT trade negotiations, will not fail because of any lack of will or determination of the United States to see it through to a satisfactory conclusion.

So, Mr. Speaker, the policy is to push through the 50-percent reduction in any event. If the facts of our nonexistent trade surplus that have recently come to light do not greatly temper the determination mentioned by Mr. Roth, we can only wonder what is the administration's real attitude toward domestic industry. Is it to be sacrificed willy-nilly because Congress passed the Trade Act over 3 years ago under the false impression that we were riding high in foreign export markets?

I do not believe that we should plunge blindly ahead with further drastic tariff reductions when our trade statistics, if properly reported, would reveal our weak competitive position in world markets.

We would be ill advised, I am convinced, to proceed under the assumption that present high levels of production and employment in this country would justify opening up our market to growing volumes of imports when it is clear that so far as really competitive trade is concerned we are running a deficit. If there is any doubt about this deficit, I think it should be cleared up.

I am joining others who have introduced a joint resolution calling on the Commerce and Treasury Departments to issue summary trade reports that will show our true competitive standing in the world rather than obscuring the facts. I trust that the Ways and Means Committee will hold early hearings so that all doubts can be resolved.

FRED BUSBEY, THE RUGGED INDIVIDUALIST

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock to me to learn of the passing of my very good friend, Fred Busbey, who served in this body with distinction in the 78th, 80th, 82d, and 83d Congresses. Inasmuch as he was elected from what is generally known as a politically marginal district, he was not able to have continuity of service and the opportunity to demonstrate his full worth. Notwithstanding this, in each Congress that he served he contributed immeasurably to its deliberations.

We frequently use the descriptive term "rugged individualist" without our always being quite certain what it means. But I think that anyone who was privileged to know Fred Busbey would understand exactly what is meant when we refer to him as a "rugged individualist."

He was a man of convictions, with courage of his convictions, and more than just ordinary courage. He would fight to the bitter end, even if he stood alone, for what he believed. Nothing could deter him

During World War I, he served as a Regular Army sergeant, and he participated in some of the hardest fought battles of that war. He was proud of this, and justly so. And as I fondly reflect on Fred's service in the Congress, he showed the same ruggedness and determination and ingenuity that somewhat typifies a military sergeant. He did not seek glory for glory's sake. He sought results, and he got results.

With the passing of Fred Busbey I have lost a very fine friend. He will never be forgotten by any of us privi-

leged to know him.

McNENNY FISH HATCHERY AT SPEARFISH, S. DAK.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate to find that the 1967 budget for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife does not include any proposed expenditure for the current building and expansion program being undertaken at the McNenny Fish Hatchery at Spearfish, S. Dak.

The McNenny hatchery, constructed in 1951, produces rainbow and brown trout primarily for stocking waters in the Black Hills trout management area. This area contains about 175 miles of trout streams and 1,900 acres of trout lakes, which provide an estimated 800,000 man-hours of angling annually. In addition to this, this hatchery supplies 17 counties in western South Dakota, 21 counties in western North Dakota, 10 counties in eastern Wyoming, and a large Bureau of Reclamation reservoir in Nebraska. The average annual production of all species is about 70,000 pounds.

During the past several years the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and State and local governments have constructed numerous new impondements in South Dakota, and the three neighboring States. Many of these reservoirs provide excellent trout fishing; however, to maintain the fishery, frequent planting of fingerling fish is required. Requests for fingerling trout by management agencies exceed the present production capabilities of the hatchery.

The McNenny hatchery also serves as a production test center for the formulation and testing of fish diets. This has resulted in significant improvements in our ability to produce quality diets at substantial cost savings. A new building is needed to house testing and diet formulation equipment, and to provide additional fingerling production facilities. With funds provided in fiscal year 1966—

\$25,000—a well is at the present time being drilled to supplement the hatchery's water supply.

The development program, which I shall outline in a moment, must be undertaken to increase the production of fish and to improve efficiency of operations immediately. The expanded facilities would mean about 100,000 pounds of trout could be produced annually, approximately doubling the present fingerling production.

The development program includes the following items:

Pipeline	\$10,000
Broodstock raceways	20,000
Production building and facilities	120,000
Residence	20,000
Sewage disposal system	20,000
Equipment	15,000

Therefore, the total estimated cost of the program is \$205,000. I urge the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and each Member of this House to carefully consider this building program, and urge that the necessary funds be included in the 1967 fiscal year budget so this important construction program can continue without interruption.

FEDERAL REVENUES FOR USE IN STATE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining several of my Republican colleagues in introducing legislation to share a portion of Federal revenues with each State for use in public elementary and secondary education.

The bill would establish an educational assistance trust fund, into which 1 percent of the revenue received from the Internal Revenue Code and tariff schedule would be deposited the first year, 2 percent the second year, up to 5 percent the fifth year, and thereafter.

Tax sharing for education is based on a two-part formula: half of the money would be returned to the States on a per-student basis; the other half would be based on the amount of effort each State is currently putting into education. "Effort" is defined as the percent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education.

The concept of tax sharing to bolster the State's abilities to provide those services which are within its domain is an attractive one to all those who fear intervention by Washington in local matters. Education, along with other services, is becoming more and more difficult for States to afford. State taxes have risen steadily, from \$4.9 billion 20 years ago to \$24.2 billion in 1964. In 1963 alone, property taxes rose 7.3 percent over 1962 rates, sales taxes increased by 8.7 percent, corporation taxes by 7.5

percent, and personal income tax by 6.3 percent.

All this has been caused by the increase in State and local expenditures. These have risen by 600 percent since the mid-1940's. The cost of education alone has risen over 700 percent in that time, from \$3 billion in 1946 to \$22 billion. And this outlay for education is expected to double by 1972.

State and local taxes have risen about as high as they can go, with the Federal Government preempting so much of the national income through Federal income tax. This leaves State and local governments in the position of having no place to turn except to the Federal Government.

However, the knowledge of local situations, needs, and problems is at the local and State level. They are far better able to improve their educational programs themselves. Gigantic Federal programs too often result in Federal control and the imposition of rules which are not in the best interests of education in all areas.

This year we have seen several localities in the United States refuse aid under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, because they feared overcontrol by the Office of Education. They would rather struggle along in freedom than lose control of the education of their children to those in farremoved offices in Washington.

For experience has taught us that Federal subsidy brings Federal control. The tax-sharing plan, however, lets the Federal Government provide the funds and lets the States determine how these can best be used to supplement their own efforts.

Built into the formula is the assurance that no State will then decide to sit back and let Uncle Sam pay the bills, for the amount a State receives depends in great part upon its own per student expenditures. If anything, this will spur the States on to greater effort.

To assure that the money is spent for education, plans will be submitted by the Governor to the Comptroller General of the United States each year, and at the end of the year an audit must be submitted to show actual use. This approach gives a tremendous boost to the education of our young people. Per pupil expenditures can increase greatly through Federal contributions and at the same time, incentive will be provided for each State to make even more effort on its own.

There would be no need for a great expansion of Federal personnel in Washington to administer the program—it would be handled by the local officials already on the job. It would yield us the greatest return on our investment, for it would utilize the best capabilities of each level of government.

Our federal system is a precious freedom which we must strive to preserve and strengthen. It is built firmly upon the Federal-State cooperation and division of powers and responsibilities, such as I propose in this bill. And like every other precious thing we know in America, its strength is in the education of each new generation to carry it on and

protect it. Surely, then, we can make no wiser investment in our Nation's future than by the speedy passage of this bill.

ROTATION NOW IN VIETNAM

Mr. SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Roncalio], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that from thinly populated Wyoming, with less than 320,000 human beings, six families have been called upon to pay the supreme price of the escalation of our

Vietnam military posture. These six fatalities are:

First. Alma Jack Stumpp, Afton, Wyo. Second. Ernest Taylor, Jr., Kaycee, Wyo.

Third. Robert Fred Guthrie, Chey-

enne, Wyo.

Fourth. Craig Blackner, Lyman, Wyo. Fifth. Sam Lee Delos, Ten Sleep, Wyo. Sixth. Ladd Condy, Cheyenne, Wyo.

What is particularly tragic, Mr. Speaker, is that in the case of at least two of the above war casualties from Wyoming had there been some type of rotation policy in effect in Vietnam their lives might have been spared.

Mr. Guthrie, a young man from Cheyenne, Wyo., was killed within 30 days prior to the completion of his tour of duty—after a 4-year hitch as a corpsman

in the U.S. Marines.

On November 17, 1965, Ernest E. Taylor—a specialist 4th class—from Kaycee, Wyo., was killed in action. Two days before, he had written to friends that he expected to be released from combat duty on December 10 to begin his trip home, following his stretch of duty. In this case he was killed less than 3 weeks prior to the completion of his tour.

These two deaths show again the necessity for a review now of the military policy that asks far too much of a few while far too many get by giving far too little in this process of defending America in time of its military engagements.

Because of my own personal experience in the 1st Infantry Division in World War II, Mr. Speaker, an American Regular Army Division again engaged in combat in Vietnam—I believe it is proper to call to the attention of my colleagues at this time this glaring inequity in the Armed Forces of the United States. I have, accordingly, written to the Secretary of Defense suggesting a rotation policy for men in combat, and if none is forthcoming, I shall introduce legislation to that effect.

It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that these conflicts in policing the world—and particularly our Vietnam commitment—may extend for a long period of time. This being true, a certain number of set days in combat or "in contact with the enemy," becomes the only real goal which a fighting man understands in carrying

out the daily ordeals of combat.

We in the Halls of Congress, we in the safe, well-fed sectors of America, may be moved by the euphonious principles daily restated in these difficult times. But to men eating the C-rations and sleeping in swamps, to men digging holes in the jun-

gle and fighting and dying—so many days in combat and then home—this is the only language they truly understand.

A man in combat feels one thing above all else—and that is that he stays alive in order to come home to his loved ones. If a rotation policy is in effect, he is a better soldier because of it. If one is not in effect, Mr. Speaker, he has no goal; he has only bleakness and a constantly doubtful moral factor at best, which will always affect his proficiency.

I stress again, Mr. Speaker, experience has taught us that the first thing for which any man fights is his self-preservation. I believe we had better establish a firm and definite policy of rotation for our great fighting men now. It should be so many days in combat, during all of which they may look forward to returning home. Thus somebody in the training camps or civilian life in America, can take their place to carry on the fight which means so much to so many.

I believe a strong immediate rotation policy should be placed in effect so that at least five riflemen with the most overseas duty per company per month should be rotated home and replaced with recruits from stateside.

I believe these five men should come from every combat unit in South Vietnam, and I believe that at least two men should be rotated home from all support, supply, and other noncombat units now in these theaters of operations.

Mr. Speaker, I stress that this is a matter of equity and of the basic concepts of justice—and I hope my colleagues will take an interest in this vital matter.

In World War II in the Big Red One—the 1st Division—it was said that there were two ways to get home, by rotation or in a pine box—in a mattress cover, to be exact. In my sparsely populated district, which is the State of Wyoming, Mr. Speaker, six young men have come home so far via a pine box. It is time now to assure that the next six to come home to Wyoming come home alive and well, and able to know the respect and admiration of a grateful people.

THE WAR THAT FOREIGN AID FIGHTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am told by those who have visited the battlefronts in South Vietnam that average life expectancy in Vietnam is only 35 years. You may be surprised to learn, however, that this figure has nothing to do with the bullets of the Communist enemy. This figure is the result of the ravages of other enemies: disease, hunger, and ignorance. The United States is engaged in a war on these killers as well as the terror and death spread by the Vietcong.

The soldiers on this second front are the teams of doctors being trained with the help of U.S. medical personnel and equipment provided through our AID program. Medical centers in Hue and Saigon are now graduating 150 doctors a year to take charge of the country's expanding medical services. More than 12,000 health centers have been established and stocked with medicines in rural health programs manned by 8,000 newly trained village health workers. When the United States started its battle against disease and squalor in Vietnam, there were fewer than 200 civilian doctors attending to the medical needs of 16 million people.

The importance of this effort is not diminished by the fact that Vietcong guerrillas destroy some of the new health units as soon as they are constructed. In every village where a Government health center is caring for the sick and undernourished there is visible proof of which side is concerned with the welfare of the people, proof which the Vietcong seek to obliterate.

The AID-supported health program started with the introduction of sani-

tary water supplies in the ancient capital of Hue, as well as in Saigon. In rural areas, outdoor sanitary facilities have

been added.

A major campaign against malaria which was initiated with the help of U.S.-trained malaria teams, has reduced the incidence of new cases to less than 2 percent a year.

Deaths from malaria have been reduced from 35,000 in 1958 to 2,000 in 1965. Seven million people have been vaccinated against cholera, and 8 million more have received vaccinations and treatments for other diseases.

American civilians are responding increasingly to the Vietnamese Government's call for medical help. The latest group of American doctors to volunteer their services in Vietnam included 30 Cuban refugees. One hundred personnel from the U.S. Army Medical Civilian Action Program are also serving.

While there are many inadequacies and shortcomings in our AID program in Vietnam, there is no questions but that this humanitarian effort equals or exceeds in importance our military effort there. The Agency and the administration are now making a major effort to win the nonmilitary war in Vietnam—and are successfully persuading the South Vietnamese Government to place more emphasis in this direction. This effort as fully deserves our support as the military authorization on which we will shortly be acting.

SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS HELP

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which

must be passed if the small businessmen of this Nation are to receive the assistance the Congress intends they receive. My bill would separate the revolving funds under the Small Business Act so that the Small Business Administration could not reach into direct business loan funds even if some widespread disaster would justify that action. In the case of a disaster requiring additional financial assistance from SBA, a separate supplemental appropriation would be required. The thrust of this bill is to keep inviolate the small business direct loan program which has been so important to the small businessmen of the Nation.

The legislation I have introduced would not increase the SBA appropriation but would divide it into three separate revolving funds reserved for specific purposes. The Small Business Act now provides for only one with allocations set administratively within SBA.

My bill would establish one revolving fund for direct business loans under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, prime contract authority under section 8(a), and loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in the amount of \$1 billion.

A second revolving fund totaling \$300 million is set up for disaster loans under section 7(b) and section 7(b) (2). The third separate revolving fund is set up for programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958—except for title IV of that act—and the bill authorizes \$461 million for this fund.

My bill also sets limits for the amounts of loans, guarantees and commitments which may be outstanding at any one time under each of the three funds.

Mr. Speaker, the need for legislation such as I have introduced today has been amply demonstrated on a number of occasions in recent years. The recent transit strike in New York City dramatized the seriousness of the failure of the Small Business Administration to seek funds necessary to maintain an effective direct loan program. Congress must take take immediate action to provide these funds.

Although SBA suspended its direct loan last October 11, it took no steps to obtain sufficient funds to avert economic disaster should an emergency arise. When the transit strike became an extended emergency, thousands of small businessmen were faced with economic ruin and SBA had no resources to assist them. Instead, SBA was forced to hastily round up extra funds to provide direct There is some question whether the \$20 million SBA raised from a revolving fund was enough to meet the need. But the main point is that SBA's mad dash for money was precisely the wrong approach and should not have been necessary.

Suspension of the direct loan program is now in its sixth month and SBA officials still are unable to tell us when they will be able to lift the moratorium. True, SBA is studying ways of better organizing the loan program, but that is little comfort to the businessman who needs a loan now.

I urge all my colleagues to join with me in taking positive action to put the

small business direct loan program back on its feet. We can afford no further delay.

ESTONIA—INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor to extend congratulations to the thousands of supporters in America of Estonian independence and to the captive people of Estonia on this February 24, the anniversary of their independence. While the Estonian nation has experienced many misfortunes since their 1918 declaration of independence, the ebullient quest for freedom and liberty that was once achieved, remains strong today.

Yes, Russia still wields its overpowering influence in Estonia, but even 22 consecutive years of Russian occupation have not succeeded in destroying the Estonians' determination to remain true to

their own cultural heritage.

The shameful and sometimes barbaric treatment of the people of Estonia at the hands of the Russian Communists is surpassed perhaps only by that of Nazi Germany. Proof of Russian brutality and virtual extermination of much of Estonia's people lies in the stark population statistics of 1934 and 1959. During that 25-year interval the Estonian population decreased by approximately 120,-000. Primary methods employed by the Soviets which account for those losses were purges, deportations, and murders, Many Estonians were forced to become refugees, many of whom were able to come to America. But this policy of the Russians had another facet; the number of Russians in Estonia grew by more than 167,000 during the same period. It is estimated that more than 240,000 persons from the Soviet Union have "migrated" into Estonia. We are all aware that the purpose of this Russian program was to dilute Estonian nationalism through a tremendous influx of persons loyal to Mother Russia. However, strong Estonian resistance to this imperialist Russian subterfuge has been a leading factor in its failure and is quite reminiscent of the historic failures during the 1721-1918 period of czarist Russian occupation.

Americans of Estonian descent have continued their activities in support of liberty for their captured brethren. America can take pride in the fact that she has welcomed to her shores more than 60,000 Estonian refugees from Nazi and Communist persecution. Though naturally concerned about events in Estonia, these Estonian-Americans have freely joined in the fight to improve man's condition wherever he is found.

While much of the world's attention has been focused on such vital issues as Vietnam and proliferation of nuclear weapons, we must not lose sight of the plain and overriding issue of fundamental human freedom. The people of Estonia are unfortunate victims who bear witness to the fact that the struggle for freedom is not limited to the "undeveloped" areas of the world. It is being carried out wherever one group of people uses force or intimidation to subject another group to its will. It is in this light we should consider the case of Estonia.

It is a travesty of the meaning of freedom that these people must be forced to observe the passing of another anniversary while in the cruel and vise-like grasp of Communist Russia. Let us in everyway possible and at every opportunity call to the world's attention the plight of the people of Estonia and the rest of the souls Communist Russia still maintains in virtual bondage.

VASCO DE SOUSA JARDIM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

awanr

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening in my hometown of Newark I was privileged to join with many of my friends in the community in paying tribute to one of New Jersey's most distinguished citizens, Vasco de Sousa Jardin. Founder, editor, publisher of New Jersey's weekly Portuguese language newspaper, Vasco Jardim's influence extends well beyond New Jersey and well beyond his ethnic associations. And for his more than 40 years of service to the community and to his fellow Portuguese-Americans, Vasco Jardim was singled out to receive the highest civilian honor that can be awarded by the Government of Portugal: Conferral of the Order of Prince Henry.

It was a joyous occasion, this dinner, and I was honored myself by being asked to participate in the events. His Excellency Vasco Viera Garin, Ambassador of Portugal to the United States, made the presentation to Mr. Jardim, while such leading figures within the Portuguese-American community as Father Jose L. Capote: Father Anthony Monteiro: Donald B. Gomes, the chairman; Frank Soares, cochairman; Dr. Manuel L. da Silva, toastmaster; Antonio Braga, re-cording secretary; Mrs. Daniel Rodrigues, corresponding secretary; and Mario Teixeira, Jr., treasurer, were responsible for the well-organized success of the entire affair.

Vasco Jardim typifies the great men who have made America great since our early days. Born in the Madeira Islands of Portugal, he came to this country in 1920, settled and married in one of the largest Portuguese-American communities in southwestern Massachusetts, moving to Newark in 1928. Even as in Fall River and New Bedford, Vasco Jardim immediately became a powerful force for good in his new community.

As a reporter, he was always aware of his responsibility for truth; as a citizen, he helped weld into the community those of his own ethnic heritage and helped the community to wipe away the artificial barriers that are often set around ethnic groups.

Many years ago John Donne wrote: No man is an island sufficient unto itself.

Each of us is touched, each of us is affected and changed, for better or for worse, by the actions of others. Because this is true, all of Newark, all of New Jersey and so many communities beyond our State lines stand in the debt of the man we honored last Saturday evening.

Good deeds are as the stars which shine brightly in the dark sky of night. We do not notice them in the sun-filled glare of day-to-day living; but they are there, nevertheless, to brighten the world at an hour when it most needs brightening. Saturday night we paid tribute publicly to one who so has brightened the world; to one who has given so much without reckoning the cost; to one who has labored so valiantly without regard for reward.

Vasco Jardim has made the world a little richer, a little warmer and a much, much better place for all of us. To which we can only add our sincere and heartfelt thanks and our prayers that he will long continue to do so.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I consider the setting aside today of our legislative duties for a few moments to recognize Estonia's independence anniversary as being a fitting tribute to the Estonian people. And yet, as I offer my congratulations to Estonia and to her many friends here in America, the occasion leaves me with mixed emotions. First, I am very privileged and grateful to wish Estonia well, but at the same time I am saddened when I reflect on the suffering and sacrifice that country has had to endure only to find itself still under the heel of Soviet Russia.

Estonia is a proud land. She endured almost 200 consecutive years of czarist domination before she achieved her independence on February 24, 1918. However, in spite of that fact, her nationalist fervor took root and culminated in the country's becoming independent in 1918. Ridding one's country of foreign troops almost singlehandedly is not an easy thing to do. And in addition, Estonia had to fight German troops on one front while repelling Russian forces on another.

While attempting to solidify their newly won independence, the Estonians quickly discovered that running an independent state is not a simple matter. But the people eagerly joined in and the

battle for domestic progress and stability was joined.

Soviet Russia had no intention of permitting that attempt at democracy so close to its borders to succeed, and merely awaited an opportunity to quash the Estonian Government. That opportunity was provided through the fanaticism of Hitler and World War II. Through heinous, brutal, and illegal methods, Russia gained control of the country in 1940, and resumed that control in 1944. Tragically, that control exists today.

Free men and women must determine how much longer that situation will exist. We must accept our responsibilities and play our roles, no matter how small or large, and examine Russia's imperialistic relationship with Estonia.

As we join in wishing congratulations on the anniversary of Estonian independence, let us try to make that event a liv-

ing reality once again.

REV. GAETANO RUGGIERO

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week the city of Newark was saddened by the passing of one of its outstanding citizens and spiritual leaders, the Reverend Gaetano Ruggiero. Father Ruggiero's loss is a deep sorrow to the thousands of us who knew him, and the parishioners of St. Lucy's Church, which he served as pastor for almost 34 years, will long miss his kind and inspiring guidance and leadership. But we can take solace in remembering the many years during which we were blessed by his work among us. Under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD at this point an editorial and a column by Vince Tuzzolo from the Italian Tribune of February 18, 1966, which eloquently express what we all feel about Father Ruggiero:

[From the Italian Tribune, Feb. 18, 1966] Rev. GAETANO RUGGIERO

Those of us who were privileged to know and love Rev. Gaetano Ruggiero, and there are many, were saddened this week by his death.

He was first of all a dedicated priest and the beloved pastor of St. Lucy's Church for more than 33 years. But he was more—much more. Sincere, friend, spiritual adviser, family counselor, you could call him all of these and still not capture with words his personal magnetism and momentous achievements.

He exemplified the qualities that have elevated the standards of our community to the high plane on which it is firmly established.

Our only comfort is that he has joined Almighty God whom he served so well for so long.

His mortal remains are buried on the grounds of St. Lucy's Church. His spirit will live on.

[From the Italian Tribune, Feb. 18, 1966] FATHER RUGGIERO

The passing of Rev. Gaetano Ruggiero, beloved pastor of St. Lucy's Church has left

a void in the hearts of the thousands of parishioners who over the years have occupied pews and sat attentively as the good padre read the gospel or delivered a meaningful sermon with purpose. That they will miss the likeable little priest, who won his way into the hearts of many and succeeded to earn the respect and admiration of the most hardened parishioners goes without saving.

A deeply dedicated man of the cloth, Father Ruggiero, was best known for his warmth and understanding, qualities which were reflected in his ready smile and mirrored in the sparkle of his eyes. Much like the shepherd who led his flock, Father Ruggiero, was a stalwart leader who stood as a guiding influence among the people of the parish. Testimony to his talents are the many successful accomplishments during his pastorate. The completion of the church, the erection and decoration of the Chapel of St. Gerard Shrine and the new rectory along with the St. Lucy's Community Center. His last act was the signing of a contract for the installation of air conditioning in the church.

It can also be said that Reverend Ruggiero was proud of the St. Lucy's Bugle and Drum Corps, national champions and winner of many titles and competitions. It might also be added he was somewhat delighted over the championships garnered by the St. Lucy baseball teams. Although, never known to be athletically inclined, Father Ruggiero was an advocate for good clean athletic and recreational participation. He viewed this form of exercise as a healthy outlet for the abundant energies stored up in the bodies of our young. Although he often added as an afterthought, "they are less likely to get into mischief."

There is much that can be said of this humble, kind man, whose career spanned more than 50 years in the priesthood. He studied at the Acireale Seminary in Sicily and attended the Gregorian University in Rome where he earned his bachelor of divinity and doctor of canon law.

He came onto St. Lucy's in the year of 1932 as pastor to succeed the late Msgr. Joseph Perotti. He completed much of the work started by the late Monsignor while realizing many of his own initiated programs.

Man and boy, the writer had known Father Ruggiero for many years, first as a parishioner and in the years to follow as a follower and supporter of his many projects.

He was blessed with a great retentive memory and knew the faces and names of almost all the parishioners and their offsprings. We will still remember the events of our first meeting and introduction. "Tuzzolo," he had said, "yes, you are the son of Theodora." My mother was a deeply religious woman. In fact, we daresay she was in church more than she was home.

The moments we recall best of Father Ruggiero are those in which we found him in his office at the rectory. At his desk, writing a letter and on other occasions immersed in deep meditation. There were other times when, listening to his stereo, he was carried away by some familiar aria and hummed along with the tune. He loved music and some of his leisure hours were spent listening to the classics. He knew practically every score of all the operas.

Then there was the time early last year when the writer, in company with Anthony Coppola, called on the Father to tell him he had been selected for the Tribune Award as the "Outstanding Citizen." His first reaction was one of surprise. Then, recovering from this unlooked for event, he turned to us and said, "While I am deeply grateful for this honor I am sure there are many others more deserving." Father advised us to look elsewhere for someone else. However, we assured him we would not take no for an answer, as this was the decision of the awards committee.

Out of respect for him we conceded to give him time to think it over, stating that his acceptance would in a large sense do us honor. We were happy to find on our next visit several weeks later he was to give his consent.

There are countless things we remember of this wonderful little priest, whose wise counsel and spiritual guidance enriched the lives of the many of us who had the benefit of his teachings. Requiescat in pacem.

NEWARK 300

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening an ambitious, resourceful and challenging project was unveiled to commemorate my hometown's tercentennary. Under the directorship of Thomas C. Murray, a teacher at Essex Catholic High School, the students of the high school put together a topical review of Newark's 300 years.

Even if I had not been a lifelong resident of Newark, I would still have been pleased and favorably impressed by the scope and thoroughness of the student's work. "Newark 300" gives deserved attention and new dimension to the many and varied roles which our city has played through 3 eventful centuries of history—from the hazards and hardships of early colonial life to the search for values and individual identity at the dawn of the space age.

A bustling community, rich in culture and tradition long before the Declaration of Independence, Newark retained its early pioneering spirit as its driving force through years of growth and greatness as it became a leader in manufacturing, commerce, banking, and transportation, and an important contributor to the cultural enrichment of the Nation.

It is always fascinating to poke among the burned-out ashes of yesterday's fires the peek behind the curtained cobwebs of the past. We find so much to stir our fancy, so much to cause us to reflect.

No one knows this better than Miss Miriam Studley, the inspired director of the New Jersey Room of Newark's Public Library. Wisely enough, the students of Essex Catholic dedicated the book they they compiled on Newark's history to Miss Studley, for she was genuinely deserving of this tribute.

When skillfully applied, the lessons of the past help us to understand the present that we may build a better future. With this in mind, I suggested that this anniversary salute be dedicated to the Newark of tomorrow.

Three hundred years have taken their toll. Blight has crept into older neighborhoods. Some buildings have deteriorated beyond repair and usefulness. Narrow horse-and-buggy streets need to be widened to accommodate modern vehicles.

The Federal Government has recognized its responsibility to help the big

cities solve the problems induced by age and urbanization. And Congress has been accelerating programs of Federal aid for vitally needed renewal projects, for new housing, for new roads, for replacement of outworn municipal equipment.

Newark has been getting its fair share of Federal aid. Wherever one looks in Newark today, one is heartened by the sight of new construction rising on locations where eyesores recently festered. The facelifting is going well. The telltale wrinkles of old age are being smoothed over, and a new, young Newark can confidently look ahead to a promising future of gracious growth—economically, socially, culturally.

"Newark 300," its director, Thomas C. Murray, its creators, the students of Essex Catholic High School deserve the thanks, the praise of all Newark citizens for their singular contribution to understanding our past, planning our future.

TO IMPROVE AND UPDATE THE FED-ERAL-STATE EMPLOYMENT SERV-ICES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 13037, designed to improve and update the Federal-State Employment Services, and to make them into the kind of institution which these times demand. A similar bill has been introduced in the other body by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, and the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the other body, chaired by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK, have planned joint hearings to begin on or about March 1. It is our hope that these hearings, the hearings that have been held on Employment Service and Manpower Problems by our two subcommittees in the recent past and the report of the Secretary of Labor's Task Force on the Employment Service will provide a record on which the Congress can, this year, move to meet the growing needs in this area.

The bill which I have introduced today does not, let me assure you, seek to create a monolithic, federalized, public employment service which will try to, or be able to, swallow up the private employment services. Let that tired old charge be laid to rest right now.

On the contrary, this bill will not only strengthen the Federal and the State manpower services, but empowers the Secretary of Labor to cooperate actively with the private employment services, as well as with other public agencies and private groups which may be able to

serve the goal which all those interested in the manpower problem seek to reach—a state of affairs in which job openings are widely publicized, in which quaiffied workers are available to meet industry's needs, and in which the new techniques of information exchange are placed at the disposal of the entire manpower services profession—public and private, State, and Federal.

This great Nation's human resources, Mr. Speaker, are the real cornerstone of our national strength. These resources are rich and they are varied, but the demands upon them are growing as rapidly as human ingenuity can devise new products, new skills, and new ways of

doing things.

In times past, people have commented on the tragic irony of starvation in one area and food surpluses in another. An equally tragic irony is the fact of labor shortages in one part of our economy and unemployment in another. If we are to see our manpower resources used wisely, if the age of automation is to be, as indeed it can be, an age in which the benefits of technology are to be placed at the service of human beings, we need an active national manpower policy. And if we are to have such a policy, we need the tools to shape and carry out such a policy.

The Manpower Services System which this bill seeks to create is one of those tools. I hope the Congress will consider it, will shape it further to meet our national manpower needs, and make it available to the American people.

LEGISLATION TO INSURE SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Culver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to insure that the special school milk program is extended with an adequate appropriation to assure the continued availability of milk at a moderate price for consumption in our Nation's schools.

I was concerned with the earlier action of the Budget Bureau in refusing to release \$3 million already appropriated for the special school milk program this year, and I am deeply disturbed by the proposal to cut funds for the school lunch program by 12 percent and the special milk program by almost 80 percent for the coming fiscal year.

These programs have through the years proven to be especially effective means of assisting schools in providing nutritionally desirable diets to grade and high school students at moderate prices. I feel they have in this important manner contributed to the health and development of the Nation's future generation.

During fiscal year 1964 nearly 60 million school lunches and over 50 million additional half-pints of milk were served

CXII-256-Part 3

to students in the State of Iowa alone under these extremely successful and popular programs. I have personally visited in 68 schools in northeast Iowa this fall, and have eaten with students in their cafeterias. I know how valuable the programs are to the overall education effort in the State.

I can see no need to reduce these successful programs which cost relatively little and have provided enormous nutritional benefits for the Nation's students at the same time that new and unproven proposals are receiving additional funds. Moreover, the effect of these cuts is almost certain to impose further strain upon already overburdened property taxes and local school budgets, as well as to increase the cost of milk to our schoolchildren.

It is, of course, extremely important to closely review all programs of Government to avoid unnecessary expenditures. I am afraid, however, that when the unquestioned benefits of providing proper nutritional advantages for so many of the Nation's students is weighed against the comparatively small cost of the program, the proposed reductions may prove to be unwise economy.

I sincerely hope that hearings will be held on this legislation at an early date by the appropriate committees of Congress, and that the benefits of the programs will be extended.

LEGAL AID FOR INDIGENTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gilbert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, recent news accounts disclose that David G. Bress, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, has rejected a proposal to provide indigent suspects with lawyers during stationhouse interrogations by the police. Washington Post, February 15, 1966. The proposal was submitted by the neighborhood legal service project, which is part of the war on poverty program in the District. The suggested stationhouse legal aid program would have been manned by the project's staff attorneys and volunteers from the local bar associations. At a time when the resources of this Nation are being mobilized to help the poor, it is most disturbing that the U.S. Attorney in the Nation's Capital should not allow legal assistance to be made available to indigent suspects in the stationhouse.

At issue here is the question of the point at which a criminal suspect becomes entitled to legal assistance, and whether the indigent suspect may be denied the opportunity for legal assistance at the stationhouse which the wealthy suspect is able to obtain.

It is difficult to understand why the U.S. attorney would turn down an offer to provide such legal aid to indigents. Apparently the Federal Government's policy of encouraging legal help to the

poor is not fully understood—in any event, it is not being fully effectuated.

Apparently one of the reasons the U.S. attorney rejected the proposed offer of legal aid at this time is that he desires to await the outcome of five cases pending before the Supreme Court which raise many questions concerning a suspect's rights in the interrogation stage a criminal case. The pending cases are: California v. Stewart, No. 584; Miranda v. Arizona, No. 759; Vignera v. New York, No. 760; Westover v. U.S., No. 761; Johnson v. New Jersey, No. 762.

These cases reflect the split among the lower courts over the scope in the Supreme Court's holding in Escobedo v. Illinois, 378 U.S. 478, June 1964, where the Court reversed a murder conviction because Escobedo had confessed after the police refused to let him see his lawyer, who was in the stationhouse at the time, asking to see Escobedo. In effect, the Court held that the fifth amendment's privilege against self-incrimination and the sixth amendment's guarantee of defense counsel do extend to the police station. No one can predict with certainty as to how much the Escobedo decision will be clarified by the Court in the pending cases. However, it is virtually certain that the Court will resolve the issue which splits lower courts around the country today. That is, whether the police must advise a prime suspect of his right to remain silent and his right to a lawyer before eliciting a confession from him.

Of course, it is necessary to emphasize that where law enforcement officials have not yet "focused" on a particular suspect, they remain free and unhampered to investigate criminal cases by gathering information and evidence from witnesses without applying the strict ruling of Escobedo.

If the Court holds that the police have no such obligation, the Escobedo decision will have then been limited to the peculiar facts in that case. Rarely do lawyers appear in the precinct house while a suspect is being questioned. Nor are many suspects worldly enough or financially able to afford an attorney. However, it would be difficult for the Court to limit the Escobedo decision to only those situations where a suspect's attorney is already present at the stationhouse and the suspect specifically requests to see him.

For, as the Court there stated:

Nothing we have said today affects the powers of the police to investigate "an unsolved crime," by gathering information from witnesses and by other "proper investigative efforts." We hold only that when the process shifts from investigatory to accusatory—when its focus is on the accused and its purpose is to elicit a confession—our adversary system begins to operate, and, under the circumstances here, the accused must be permitted to consult with his lawyer.

Meanwhile, it would be appropriate for U.S. law enforcement officials not to worsen the existing plight of indigent accused persons by declining to permit them to have legal assistance. The offer of the neighborhood legal service project of stationhouse legal aid provided a singular opportunity for the U.S. at-

torney in the District of Columbia to assume a role of national leadership with respect to protecting legal rights of accused persons.

It is to be regretted that a more affirmative response was not forth-

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Nedzi] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

Hawaii?

There was no objection. Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker—

The news may be good or bad—we shall tell you the truth.

These words were spoken in the first broadcast of the Voice of America, in February 1942.

With these words, America embraced a mighty principle, a principle which should be our eternal guide.

The agency, in a recent booklet, explained itself in lean, admirable prose.

It said:

The Voice of America speaks to the world for America, for the Government, and for the people of the United States. It seeks to make U.S. policies intelligible. It seeks to inform. It attempts to associate the people of the United States, in their daily lives, their progress and their yearnings, with the legitimate aspirations of all people everywhere.

In my judgment, the Voice of America is effective in direct proportion to its candor and objectivity. When it is candid, when it is objective, when it reports a diversity of opinion, it is doing its job. When these elements are missing, its effectiveness is bound to decline.

If the Voice is to be listened to—it must get through. The former obstacle of jamming has disappeared in Eastern Europe, for example, except for Bulgaria. But you must attract and hold listeners in the face of radio competition from friends and adversaries. You do this by programing, packaging, and credibility. Basically, you must be listened to, and you must be respected. The interrelationship is a persistent one.

The Voice of America speaks the language of truth in 37 of the world's languages. Every day, an audience of tens of millions is reached directly in those 37 languages. In addition, 28 other languages are used for special programs. Incidentally, we broadcast more hours in "Worldwide English" than any other language.

The raw statistics of the Voice of America operation are impressive.

Packaged programs, totaling 13,000 hours are placed each week on local stations abroad.

The Voice has 100 transmitters, 56 of them overseas. This insures clear transmission in most of the world.

The Voice broadcasts close to 800 hours weekly. This compares to the U.S.S.R.'s 1,350, Red China's 900, the United Kingdom's 630, and the United Arab Republic's 580. I trust that we make up in quality any deficit in quantity.

The budget for USIA's radio arm for fiscal year 1966 is \$30.1 million.

Voice of America news editors transmit about 50,000 words of news every day. Special material is also prepared for individual countries.

There has been a revolution in communications in the 24 years since the Voice of America was born. The mass production of transistor radios, for example, has dramatically enlarged the potential listening audience. Over the years, the Voice has adapted well, for the most part, both in personnel and

equipment.

I had the good fortune to become personally acquainted with the Voice in early 1962, when the distinguished Edward R. Murrow, as head of USIA, was carrying the Agency to new highs of professional pride. Since that time I have cut nearly 125 tapes for transmis-

sion to Eastern Europe. I have found the top leadership of the Voice, including the desk officers, to be highly skilled and dedicated men. They do not tire of learning more and more about countries they are broadcasting to, while keeping fully apprised about America. Moreover, the practice of interlacing Foreign Service officers into the Voice's administrative machinery brings fresh men and fresh viewpoints into play. John Chancellor, the new director, is the first professional radioman to head the Voice. The appointment of this highly respected newsman emphasizes the importance of the Agency.

A few weeks ago, I was privileged to be a member of the congressional delegation which took part in the dedication of a new hospital in Krakow, Poland, a hospital built, in part, with counterpart funds.

Although the Polish press did not carry any coverage of the dedication until after the event, we found that the man on the street was well informed—thanks to the Voice of America—about both the hospital and about our delegation.

I had a personal experience which added deeply to my impression that the Voice has a wide audience in Poland. While in Krakow, I was called out of a dinner and informed that a shy young man was asking for me. It turned out to be my first cousin. He had learned from his village priest, who had heard the news on Voice of America, that I was a member of the delegation. Whereupon he had traveled all night on a train, hundreds of kilometers, and slept in a train station, to greet his American relative. It was a moving personal experience.

While I have had occasion to be more familiar with the Voice of America's European activities, I know of its increasing emphasis on Latin America, Asia, and Africa. A free flow of information to these continents is in our interest, in the short run and in the long run.

The Voice must resist the temptation to color its news summaries and interpretations for short-run advantages.

Understandably, there have been and there may continue to be such temptations when crisis situations erupt.

We in the Congress must resist similar temptations. In exercising our supervisory responsibilities, we can best serve our Nation in 1966 by holding the Voice to the high purposes it began with in 1942:

The news may be good or bad—but we will tell you the truth.

ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Howard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, by speeches, programs, awards, and other activities we in America today offer our recognition of Estonia's 48th anniversary. I am very proud that we have continued to offer our support and encouragement to those millions of brave people in Estonia who are held in captivity by Moscow.

Historically, however, Russian domination in Estonia has not been a new phenomenon. From 1721 to 1918, the tiny nation had been held in subjugation by czarist Russia, which had expected much effort to make the Estonian people "russified." Though suffering death, deportation, hunger, and other deprivations at the hands of Russia, the strong ties to her cultural past have sustained Estonia in resisting cultural incursions by the Soviets.

The declaration of independence of February 24, 1918, was one of the great landmarks in Estonian history, but brave and courageous deeds have been a common occurrence in that country. Therefore, I hope that as we in this country offer our congratulations to the anniversary of that February 24 event, we will pledge ourselves to stand ever ready to assist Estonia in whatever way we can in order to break Russia's stranglehold on the Estonian nation. These heroic and gallant people certainly deserve a better fate than that forced upon them by Communist Russia.

THE TAX MEASURE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Todd] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I support the tax measure we voted upon. It will accelerate the rate at which taxes are paid into the Treasury. And it will reimpose excise taxes on telephones and automobiles which we voted to remove last year, when we did not believe the demands of the conflict in Vietnam would be so great.

I support the tax measure because it is a necessary step to avoid inflation. It follows the monetary policies of the Federal Reserve System, shown in sales of Government bonds and the increase in interest rates.

But I fear the tax measure is not enough to do the job: The projected deficit is up. Unemployment is less than 4 percent, and the unemployed are, by and large, not possessed of the skills which are in demand. Thus, the unemployment rate among those who have skills needed is much less than 4 percent. Plants are operating in excess of 90 percent of capacity. Our balance of payments continues unfavorable. Commodity and consumer price indexes continue to move upward.

Our Nation is committed to a major effort to prevent southeast Asia from becoming dominated by China. At this time, large sums are required for our military operations, and increasingly large sums will be required for our development programs, designed to bring civil peace to areas secured by military operations.

We expect discipline and sacrifice of those who bear the battle. We should demand no less of ourselves at home. This is why we cannot permit inflation to occur, for it is incompatible without responsibilities.

The alternative to vigorous monetary and tax policy to avoid inflation is the imposition of price controls. As we know from past experience, price controls are only temporary palliatives and sooner or later they create such hardship and malallocation of resources that they must be removed. They are completely artificial and incompatible with a free competitive system in which prices are allowed to adjust, in the marketplace, to demand and supply. They lead to black markets, bureaucracy, and a great deal of waste of effort. Some further tax increase, in my opinion, is preferable to price controls as a means of avoiding inflation.

I suggest that study be given, if price rises continue, to the imposition of further excise taxes upon goods which are competing for scarce resources with our defense efforts. Such taxes would both drain off inflationary dollars, and reduce the demand for scarce commodities. They would not interfere directly in the free play of market forces. They would not affect those sectors of the economy not related to the defense effort. They would not require changes in the wage-price guideline formula.

Voluntary guidelines, in the long run, are not a substitute for wise and responsible fiscal policy which give the market-place full play. I hope this Congress will give further attention to the implementation of sound fiscal policy, so that the role of direct and indirect controls can be minimized, and sooner, rather than later, completely eliminated.

BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHIT-ENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1966, I wrote to Hon. John W. Bush, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, expressing my concern over the serious boxcar shortage existing in the Nation and the recent car distribution order issued by the Commission directing the Southern Railway System to turn over 350 boxcars each week to Western railroads to relieve boxcar shortages in the West.

Chairman Bush replied to my letter on February 23, 1966. The text of his letter

is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, Washington, D.C., February 23, 1966. Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITENER: This will acknowledge of your letter dated February 17, 1966, protesting Commission car distribution directions as contributing to boxcar short-

ages in the East.

The ownership of plain boxcars by U.S. class I carriers is inadequate to meet the demands of the shipping public. From January 1, 1956, to date, the available supply of this type of equipment has been reduced by more than 190,000 cars; and there continues to be in excess of 2,000 plain boxcar retirements per month over replacements. The shortage of this equipment is not limited to one area, but exists in most sections The Commission has no auof the country. thority to require carriers to purchase new equipment or to repair unserviceable equipment. The Commission does have the responsibility, however, to maintain an equitable distribution of the available supply of

The Commission has in effect several car distribution directions designed to move empty plain serviceable boxcars, with inside length less than 44 feet 8 inches and doors less than 8 feet wide, to areas in greatest distress for this type of equipment. More than 20 railroads are affected by these directions, and most of them are cooperating with the Commission in an effort to alleviate a shortage which currently is reported as in excess of 10,000 boxcars per day and where in some sections of the country shippers are being deprived of sufficient cars to meet 50 percent of requirements.

The carriers located in the eastern and southern districts as a group indicate that they have in excess of 100 percent of plain boxcar ownership on line. The northwestboxcar ownership on line. The northwest-ern district of the country is currently attempting to operate with 76 percent of own-

ership on line.

I am sure that you appreciate the fact that the Commission must be ever alert to the national requirements. However, the car situation will be closely watched, and any adjustments will be made which are deemed necessary to assure everyone his fair share of the available car supply.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. BUSH, Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the information that he has given me confirms the statements I made in the House on February 22, 1966.

The critical boxcar shortage in the Nation cannot be relieved through distribution service orders or by an increase in the fee one railroad must pay another railroad for the use of its freight equip-

The problem can be solved only by an accelerated program of boxcar construction. It is a serious problem affecting the economy of the Nation and the national defense. The Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the railroads should give immediate attention to the situation.

WASHINGTON'S NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and appalled this morning when I opened the Washington Post and discovered that the Federal Aviation Agency is contemplating spending \$150 million of the taxpayers' money to turn the Washington National Airport into a jet-age airport.

Now, I am just as much in favor of modern air travel as anyone else in this country. And I believe firmly that our airport facilities should be constantly updated and upgraded to make way for

improved air service.

But the facts surrounding the FAA's sudden compulsion to make National Airport a field for jet-age travel are curious indeed.

It has been only a few weeks, now since the FAA suddenly announced that it would allow two- and three-engine jets to land and take off at National. That decision came as a surprise to many people, I know-particularly those who live in the highly congested, built-up residential sections around National Air-

Such a decision may or may not have seemed justified to the FAA, based on the research facilities it has been using.

But the present announcement is an-

other matter entirely.

Let us look at some figures. Let us look at the background.

Dulles International Airport was first opened to the public in 1962. Ever since that time the rate of traffic for the two airports has been just about the samethe airlines and their passengers use National Airport by a 9 to 1—or better margin.

In the year ending in December 1963. there were 12,074 departures in scheduled service from Dulles compared to 98,432 from Washington National. The following year the ratio was 10,887 for Dulles to 96,520 at National.

In the 12-month period ending June 30 last year there were a total of 10.633 departures from Dulles compared to 97,556 from National.

Here we are with what is admittedly one of the world's greatest, most modern, and most architecturally impressive and airports-Dulles International-within a short drive of our Nation's Capital. And it is being bypassed by air traffic and we are being told that we must spend another \$150 million to make Washington National bigger, better, and more modern.

What justification is there for this? Dulles is a masterpiece of construction.

Is it, also, a white elephant?

It cost the American taxpayers \$119,-200,000 to open Dulles to the public in 1962-\$108 million for the terminal, hangars, and runways and another \$11,-200,000 for access roads to Interstate Route 495.

It cost the taxpayers \$38,779,709 to open Washington National Airport to the public on June 16, 1941, and make the systematic improvements to it which have been needed in the years since that time.

The most fantastic comparison I have seen thus far, however, has to do with the cost of operating the two airports annually.

Dulles, with only 10,633 departures in the last 12-month period, cost the taxpayers and users a total of \$3,984,298. At Washington National the cost was \$3,258,447—and National served nearly 10 times as many flights as Dulles did in the same time period.

There seems to be little justification for the FAA's sudden determination to glut Washington National with a massive influx and outflow of high-speed jet travel. I, for one, am deeply disturbed by this announcement. And I suspect that a large number of my distinguished colleagues in this body are, also.

While we do everything we can to keep our airport facilities abreast of modern change, we must, at the same time, keep the safety and welfare of the citizens who live in this densely populated region in and around Washington uppermost in our minds.

The FAA's front-page headlines this morning do not indicate that this Agency is mindful of the dual responsibilities it bears by law to the traveling public and those who live near airport facilities. Unless it can do both, it should contemplate a good deal more carefully before it rushes into print.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD IN-TEREST RATE HIKE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I oppose inflation and would do everything in my power to resist it because inflation hurts the average consumer, the little man, most of all. But inquiries have been coming into my office from my home district, San Antonio, relating to the general tightening up of money since the Federal Reserve Board voted by a bare 4-to-3 majority last December to hike the discount rate. It seems to these people, and to many others, that the action of the Federal Reserve Board has created a good deal of inflation this year.

Now, these inquiries are very disturbing to me because they clearly show the ill effects of the interest rate hike, and they are difficult to answer. I wonder therefore whether the Federal Reserve Board members who voted for the discount rate hike will help me satisfactorily explain to the homebuyer in San Antonio why he now has to pay 6 percent interest on a federally insured home mortgage loan? How can I explain to the homebuilder why his sick industry will probably grow sicker this year, while other industries enjoy record profits? How can I explain to the unemployed and underemployed carpenter, bricklayer, electrician, and others in the sick homebuilding industry that their plight is the direct result of recommendations made by a handful of bankers and adopted by a 4-to-3 vote of the Federal Reserve Board, and that there is nothing that I can do or that any other elected official can do to reverse the decisions of those bankers?

These are all valid questions, and they demand answers. For my part, those few who constantly argue for higher interest rates, and who now are insisting on removing the 4½-percent interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds are either unusually selfish or unusually dense

ESTONIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersy [Mr. McGrath] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 48th anniversary of Estonia's proclamation of independence as a democratic republic. Since that important event occurred, the history of this gallant people has been replete with both progress and setbacks, but the lesson of history is that although Estonia is today under the oppressive thumb of the Soviet Union, there is hope that this, too, will pass.

A mere 9 months and 4 days after declaring her independence, Estonia was attacked by Soviet Russia. This attack occurred only 13 days after Russia had declared that all peoples of the former Czarist Russia were free to secede from Lenin's "new Russia."

Again in February—February 2, 1920—after having repelled the Communist invaders for 14 months, Estonia succeeded in signing a peace treaty with Russia, and in September 1921, she was admitted to the League of Nations.

An armed coup d'etat by Communist groups on December 1, 1924, failed of success, and later investigations disclosed that the Soviet Union initiated

the plan and had infiltrated the leaders of the uprising and a large number of fighters and arms into Estonia.

Democracy flourished in Estonia until September 1939, when the Soviet Union, threatening war as an alternative, forced upon that brave nation a mutual assistance treaty under which Estonia was compelled to establish a number of Russian naval and air force bases on her territory.

The following June, the Soviet Union presented to Estonia an ultimatum demanding establishment of a new government friendly to the Soviet Union and granting of free passage to additional Soviet troops. The next day—June 17, 1940—Soviet troops marched into an occupied Estonia. On June 21, a puppet government was imposed on Estonia by Moscow. To complete this annexation, Russia admitted Estonia into the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union as a Union Republic, and a Communist constitution was adopted by the Estonian puppet government on August 25, 1940.

From that day to this, Estonia has suffered under the Russian Communist yoke, but that gallant nation has never reconciled herself to the status of a Soviet colony. Therefore, today, Estonians in their homeland and those of Estonian birth and their descendants here and elsewhere in the free world, reiterate the hope that history will, indeed, repeat itself and Estonia will soon again join hands with the free nations of the world.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE POOR AS TEACHERS' AIDS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 89-10

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will exempt the earnings of poor people employed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act from consideration as part of this income or resources under the public assistance laws.

We have very correctly made an exemption for certain earnings of public assistance recipients before. Poor persons hired under the Economic Opportunity Act do not have to count part of their income under that act in determining their eligibility for public assistance. Thus, a mother on AFDC can work part time under an antipoverty program without it resulting in a deduction of her welfare payment.

This is sensible for two main reasons. This gives an incentive to the welfare recipient to accept part-time employment through the education aid program and thereby learn skills which may lead to eventual full-time employment and self-sufficiency. The second reason this exemption should be made is that we would merely be taking Federal funds out of one Federal account to place it back into

another Federal account with no benefit to the individual employed.

I was most impressed by the statements submitted by Sargent Shriver to the ad hoc subcommittee on the war on poverty last April 30. He recounted the great advantages of employing the poor in these programs. Let me quote him:

The employment of the poor in jobs other than menial ones is a significant way of securing their participation in the program. Positions such as health aides and teacher aides represent new career opportunities in fields which have previously been reserved for those with college training. They represent a new avenue of hope for the poor at the same time that they assist the trained professional—the registered nurse or teacher, for example—in increasing his effectiveness. In addition, the poor who fill these jobs can provide an important means of communication between the impoverished and the rest of the community. They can help community action agencies to be responsive to the real needs of the poor.

What Sargent Shriver has said about the poor participating in the Economic Opportunity Act certainly applies also for their participation in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs. Title I is aimed at helping the schools and the schoolchildren in less prosperous areas of the city or State. We should encourage the mothers and older children in these areas to accept employment knowing that it will not result in an immediate reduction in their welfare aid.

That is the aim of H.R. 13073.

The language of my bill is almost identical to the exemption included in Title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act.

I hope there will be broad support for this reform.

H.R. 13073

A bill to amend title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, to provide that payments received thereunder shall be disregarded for certain public assistance purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

"Sec. 213. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under any such title shall provide that—

"(1) the first \$85 plus one-half of the excess over \$85 of payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under this title or any program assisted under this title shall not be regarded (A) as income or resources of such person in determining his need under such approved State plan, or (B) as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan; and

"(2) no payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under this title or any such program shall be regarded as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan except to the extent made available to or for the benefit of such other individual.

"(b) No funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under titles I, IV, X, XIV, or

XVI of the Social Security Act for any period before the first month beginning after the adjournment of a State's first regular legislative session which adjourns after the date of enactment of this section shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements of subsection (a)."

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, during our consideration of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, I voted for the motion to recommit and against final passage of the bill.

I should like to state that while I favored many aspects of the measure, such as the graduated withholding rates. quarterly payments by the self-employed of their estimated social security tax, and an increase in the percentage of tax to be paid currently through withholding, estimated tax payments or both, I felt compelled to vote against the bill because of the provisions relating to excise taxes on automobiles and especially telephone service.

I recognize the validity of the argument that adjustments must be made if the budget is to be kept as nearly in balance as possible and if we are to keep

our commitments in Vietnam.

On the other hand, the Excise Tax Reduction Act has been in effect approximately 8 months. It would seem to me that the budget and defense experts in the administration should have been aware of the fact that we had, last June, a costly commitment in Vietnam which would require additional funds, and they should have planned accordingly. Quite frankly, I believe that there was poor planning on the part of those experts.

I feel that it was wrong to reduce these taxes last year if it was known that a large proportion of those taxes would have to be reinstated within 8 months; and if the budget and defense experts, who recommended and supported the tax cuts, did not honestly know this last year, we need a reexamination of the personnel, policies, and procedures involved to see if we can come up with more realistic forecasts. I do not think it is fair to the American taxpayer to reduce a portion of his taxes and then within less than a year restore them either by design or poor judgment.
For that reason I voted against the

bill. I am hopeful that in the future our budget and defense experts will be able to project into the future better

than they have in this instance.

SENATOR PAT MCNAMARA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, T ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the vast majority of my constituents, when I say that it was with the greatest regret and personal sadness that I learned that the great senior Senator from Michigan, PAT McNAMARA, Will retire at the end of this year.

PAT McNamara has been an outstanding servant of the people of Michigan; he has been a respected and beloved legislator; he has been, to many of my colleagues, and to me, a valued mentor. In the 12 years that PAT McNamara has served his State and his country, he has been a driving force behind some of the most important social legislation of the century: Hospital and health care for the elderly, aid to education, civil rights, and the first concerted Federal efforts to fight poverty.

As the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, he has been responsible for programs that are helping to provide thousands of cities and towns with capital improvements that are soon translated into new jobs and improved health and welfare. This is the proud health and welfare. legacy that PAT McNAMARA will leave our Nation when he retires next January.

After a lifetime of dedicated service, first as a leader in trade unionism and then in public service, Par deserves to be able to ease up a bit. I wish him well in his retirement; but the Michigan congressional delegation and the people of Michigan will miss his leadership in the coming years.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that this afternoon when one vote came on a quorum call and another on adoption of the rule on the foreign aid bill I was with Dr. Irving Muskat, chairman of Interama, in conference with the Honorable John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, relative to some vital aspects of Interama and was not able to get back in time for these votes. However, I have, of course, voted on the other votes respecting the foreign aid bill, including final passage of the bill today.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT 14TH ANNUAL PRAYER BREAK-

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a strong believer in the power of prayer, I was deeply moved, as were others present, by the remarks of President Lyndon B. Johnson at the 14th annual President's prayer breakfast meeting, held last Thursday, February 17.

Burdened by the weight of decisionmaking demanded by his high office, and having to make decisions calling for sending of American young men into the battlefields of Vietnam, our President stated that he has found the courage to face the next day in prayer. He quoted the words of another tormented President of a past generation, Abraham Lincoln:

I have been driven to my knees many times by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seem insufficient for the day.

President Johnson added that his strength comes not only from his own prayers, but also from the prayers of the mothers who have given their sons to our country, and who in their great sorrow still found the courage to write him and to pray for him. The President was preceded by the world renowned evangelist, the Reverend Dr. Billy Graham.

Mr. Speaker, in the hope that those who did not hear the president may gain a better understanding of the heart and mind of our great leader by a reading of the complete text of his moving and inspiring remarks made on February 17, 1966, at the 14th annual President's prayer breakfast held at the Shoreham Hotel here in Washington under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE 14TH ANNUAL PRAYER BREAKFAST AT THE SHORE-HAM HOTEL, FEBRUARY 17, 1966

Dr. Graham, my beloved friend, Senator CARLSON, distinguished guests at the head table, my dear friends, I am pleased to return again to our annual prayer breakfast to be among so many of my old friends. In this room this morning we have been privileged to hear one of the great speakers and leaders of our time. He has been heard by some of the great leaders of the most powerful nations in the world, yet not a single one of us is ashamed to say, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help."

Just a few blocks from here, on the front of the National Archives, is an inscription, "The past is prologue." As your President, I have had many occasions to realize the truth of that statement. Throughout our long history our Presidents have struggled The way they recurring problems. handle those problems and their success or failures can guide us in the actions that we are called upon to take today.

But there are some things that history cannot teach us and among them is how to bear, without pain, the sending of our young Americans into battle and how to fill the aching void as we wait for the news of their fate and how to console the wife, or the mother, or the little children when that news is bad.

These are the times when I recall the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln when he said. "I have been driven to my knees many times by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seem insufficient for the day." In private prayer at unusual moments, I have found courage to meet another day in a world where peace upon earth is still only an empty dream.

The Prophet Isaiah tells us, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint."

I believe that with all my heart, but in these troubled times I am sustained by much more than my own prayers. I am sustained by the prayers of hundreds of Americans who daily take the time to look up from their own problems in order to try to give me a little encouragement in mine. Not long ago I received a letter one morning from a mother whose son had been killed in Vietnam. She spoke of the pain and the loss and the tears that are ever ready to flow, but through all of this were words of encouragement for me from this dear little lady.

In her letter she concluded, "Mr. President, I wish I could tell you all that I feel in my heart. There just aren't words, so we ask God to bless you and your little family, that He will guide you in all the terrible decisions that you must make. As long as we believe, our strength is in our faith in God and He will never fail us."

My countrymen, in those words from that dear mother are to be found the greatness of this Nation and also the strength of its President.

FINANCING OF WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the fine explanation of H.R. 12752 provided by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], and I appreciate his appeal for our support of its enactment.

I likewise appreciate the very pointed admonitions set forth by the ranking minority Member the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes]. It is heartwarming to know that an issue as vital as the financing of the war in Vietnam has such bipartisan support. However, I also agree with my colleagues who feel most strongly that this is, at least to some degree, discriminatory legislation.

Last June we removed the excise tax on many, many items, including a partial removal of the excise tax on automobiles and telephone charges. It occurs to me that we might have turned to the more luxury-type area to reimpose the excise tax. A tax on luxury items is certainly not one that touches the impoverished or the workingman. I concede also that the machinery is still in operation for collecting the excise tax on automobiles and telephones, and for that reason, it seems most appropriate that this be the area, though I reluctantly agree, where additional revenue must be found.

We all loathe war and none can deny that we are now engaged in a cruel war in Vietnam. Our servicemen dare not be denied the implements of war or the necessities for their subsistence, but since we are now engaged in this involvement I find no recourse except to approve the proposed Tax Adjustment Act of 1966.

I do so with the hope that in a very brief period of time we can restore these tax cuts and that the additional costs of warfare will be lifted from the backs of our taxpayers. While making this necessary adjustment now, I agree most wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], that we need to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures for domestic purposes-and such eliminations can be made. However, those who are suffering from inadequate economic resources today, those who have been disadvantaged by years of economic drought as many of the inhabitants of the Appalachia region, should not be made to suffer the first expenditure cuts. Wise expenditures of aid for these areas will help to replenish the Treasury in the future and improve income.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly express approval of the legislation in the hope that what we do here today, out of prudence, will provide assurances for victory in Vietnam.

THE REDWOODS DESERVE BETTER THAN COMPROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on conservation, delivered yesterday, is one of the most farreaching and farsighted on this subject, of all time. The President is to be highly commended for his generally excellent program, and particularly on his proposals to combat water pollution.

California's Governor Brown deserves credit for his efforts leading to the inclusion of a Redwood National Park in this program and for his work to secure provision of appropriate economic adjustment payments.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would be less than candid or honest if I were to say the administration's redwood proposal is adequate to preserve this great and unique resource. Unfortunately, it falls far short of what is necessary if any meaningful stands of redwoods are to be preserved for future generations of Americans.

It takes a thousand years or more to grow mature redwoods, and, once cut, much longer still to establish a climax forest, if indeed that is possible at all. This point, incidentally, is not the opinion of novices or special-interest representatives. This point was made by the National Park Service in its report of September 1964, prophetically entitled "The Redwoods, a National Opportunity for Conservation."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the administration's bill would appear to ignore this very message. It appears to disregard the simple but staggering fact that only 10 percent—or 200,000 acres—of this country's original redwood forest remains today. It appears to ignore the reality that last year alone some 15,000 acres or redwood giants fell to the woodman's ax, and that more are being felled—many in

the very area proposed for preservation—as we talk.

These facts plainly indicate that bold action is required, but bold action does not characterize the administration's plan.

This plan calls for a 43,392-acre park in the Mill Creek area of Del Norte County, including the present Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Coast State Parks. But when these State parks are included, only some 25,000 acres would be added to protected status; only 7,800 acres of additional virgin redwoods would be included, and much of this is either of mediocre quality or in the process of being cut.

This Mill Creek area is primarily important as watershed protection for the two existing State parks. It would not compare in quality or variety, in scenic or recreational features, with the 90,000-acre park at Redwood and Prairie Creeks which 28 of our colleagues in the House have joined me in calling for, and which 16 Members of the Senate introduced yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I am also disturbed about the plan to provide a separate unit of 1,400 acres in Humboldt County to protect the world's tallest trees. It is not that these trees do not need protection; they need it desperately. But this provision of only 1,400 acres raises false hopes that they could be preserved for long. Once the surrounding valley slopes are logged off, as they inevitably will be, the tallest redwoods will be exposed to wind and flood and soil erosion which will quickly number their years.

The most serious weakness in the administration's proposal, however, Mr. Speaker, is the omission of the Redwood and Prairie Creek Valleys, where sweeping vistas combine with primeval forest and wild, clear streams in a setting of unmatched grandeur. Here nearly 80,000 acres of unprotected forests are available, 33,000 of which are forested with virgin redwoods.

This is the area originally identified as most desirable for a redwood national park in a National Geographic Society study

This is the area first recommended by the National Park Service.

This is the area for a redwood park supported by the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the National Audubon Society, the National Parks Association, the Men's Garden Clubs of America, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the Nature Conservancy, Trustees for Conservation, Citizens for a Redwood National Park, and the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.

This is the area provided for in bills introduced by 45 Members of the House and Senate.

It may very well be, Mr. Speaker, that insufficient funds presently exist to acquire this entire area of primary desirability. But the answer to this limitation is not to put the limited funds available to second best use.

The answer is that if only \$56 million is available, it should be put to use in buying the best land available; \$56 million can make a very desirable start in acquiring an outstanding Redwood National Park in the Redwood Creek area,

though certainly an even more desirable one could be purchased with more plentiful funds. And if we begin in the right place we can make appropriate additions as this becomes possible.

Compromise is not worthy of this great resource. Let us pursue its preservation with the vision, imagination and determi-

nation it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times this morning, in an editorial entitled, "Retreat on Redwoods," comments thoughtfully and perceptively on this very problem. I commend it to our colleagues' attention:

RETREAT ON REDWOODS

In his message on conservation yesterday, President Johnson put forward an excellent program to combat water pollution, on which we will comment later, and he reaffirmed his support for several desirable bills now pending for national parks and seashores.

But on one of the most controversial of current issues in this field—the size of the proposed Redwood National Park in northern California—his stand is a sharp disappoint-

ment.

For some months the administration has been wavering between two plans. One, embodied in a bill by Representative Cohelan, of California, would establish a 90,000-acre park. More than a score of House Members have introduced similar bills. The alternative plan drafted within the Interior Department provided for a drastically smaller park. It would have afforded no protection to Redwood Creek Valley, which has the best surviving stand of primeval redwoods. But it would have been much more acceptable to the commercial interests that want to saw these ancient trees—some of them more than 2,000 years old—into lumber for use as building material, fenceposts, and similar purposes.

Public protests against this timidly conceived, grossly inadequate plan led to the last-minute compromise which the administration sent to Congress yesterday. It is a compromise that will satisfy no one who understands the values at stake in the preservation for all time of these unique, magnificent trees. We note with surprise and regret that Senator Kuchel, of California, has agreed to sponsor this highly unsatisfactory bill, and with even more surprise and regret that Secretary Udall lends his reputation as a conservationist to such an unworthy com-

promise.

Only 43,000 acres are to be included in this proposed park. Since this acreage includes two existing State parks, little more than half of the land would be newly protected. Moreover, fewer than 7,000 acres would consist of primeval redwoods. The Redwood Creek Valley would remain available for private exploitation—except for one pathetically small enclosure of 1,400 acres, isolated from the rest of the park.

Buying up these redwood lands from private owners would be expensive, but dollars cannot be decisive when the asset is irreplaceable. As President Johnson so eloquently said in his message, "Despite all of our wealth and knowledge, we cannot create a redwood forest, a wild river, or a gleaming seashore." We urge Congress to take the President at his word and to create a Redwood National Park worthy of his rhetoric and of the great trees that are an indescribably beautiful part of America's natural heritage.

"END MEASLES" CAMPAIGN IN RHODE ISLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in its recent "end measles" campaign, the Rhode Island Medical Society's Child School Health Committee and the Rhode Island State Department of Health took dead aim on one of this Nation's deadliest killers and cripplers—measles—in an effort to remove this mortal threat to our children from the State scene.

The entire State has been lavish in its commendation of the medical profession for recognizing and publicizing the critical need that exists for extensive vaccination of children against measles, and for its outstanding cooperation and personal involvement in this statewide pub-

lic health program.

Both Dr. Rudolf A. Jaworski, chairman of the medical society's child school health committee, and Dr. James E. Bowes, chief of the epidemiology division of the State department of health are to be congratulated for the splendid manner in which they organized and operated this program.

But I wish to pay special tribute to the more than 300 doctors and 500 nurses who volunteered their services—many at great personal sacrifice—and gave so generously of their time to conduct the "end measles" clinics, and to do the job right, as expressed by the campaign's

motto, "Once and for All."

The clinics were a huge success, despite the heaviest snowstorm of the year. Perhaps the real unsung heroes were the parents whose ingenuity led to the use of almost every known means of transportation in bringing their children to the clinics for vaccination. And I must not overlook the many couriers who battled the elements in rushing supplies of vaccine from central depots to outlying clinics.

Rhode Island is also indebted to the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service. From their regional office in Boston, they provided professional assistance when the campaign was being planned; and they provided a number of high-pressure jetinjectors for administering the vaccine and qualified personnel to operate them when the children were being vaccinated. CDC will also conduct a follow-up survey, contacting numerious Rhode Island physicians who were involved in the campaign, to obtain meaningful data on relative reaction rates. Doubtiess, the Public Health Service will report to the Nation the possibilities indicated from Rhode Island's campaign.

As a result of this statewide immunization program, the end of measles among the present generation of Rhode Island children is in sight and State planning for the future is on a firm and sure basis.

I am extremely proud that Rhode Island's "end measles" campaign was reported in a recent issue of Time. But there is a story behind the story that appeared in Time that tells why my home State was ready for a statewide vaccination program at this particular time.

Even before Rhode Island planned its statewide vaccination program, there

was evidence in the State that measles was no longer to be considered as one of those childhood phases nearly every youngster has to go through.

Relatively few citizens across this land have ever heard of a small community in Rhode Island called Burrillville; but when measles finally joins polio, small-pox, and diphtheria on the list of diseases modern medicine has virtually eliminated, Burrillville will assume its proper position. Because, in the fight against measles, Burrillville has already achieved a kind of immortality as the first community in the country to conduct a townwide measles clinic.

Its first clinic was held early in 1963 and was followed by another clinic later that year. Its third clinic was held in February of 1965 and a fourth was conducted last October.

So when Burrillville joined this year's statewide "end measles" campaign, it was actually holding its fifth measles clinic.

Great credit is due Dr. Ernest J. Smith of Burrillville, who pioneered these antimeasles clinics, and to his corps of helpers from the Burrillville-Glocester District Nursing Association. "Without their help it would not have been possi-Dr. Smith has said, adding that the particular procedure used in Burrillville involved hard work, and that it was successful only because of the fine cooperation of the local nursing association. In this regard, I am not only proud as a citizen of the State of Rhode Island, proud to represent its people in the Congress, but I am also proud from a familial standpoint: My sister, Margaret Fogarty, serves as the supervisor of the Burrillville-Glocester District Nursing Association

Thankfully, their efforts were publicized in various medical journals and served as an inspiration for other communities to adopt similar programs.

The effectiveness of the Burrillville campaign may be gaged by one statistic: During last year's measles epidemic in Rhode Island, when more than 2,000 cases were reported throughout the State, Burrillville escaped with 4 cases—and none of those who contracted the disease had been inoculated by Dr. Smith.

Great oaks can grow from little acorns. The immunization program that began in the small town of Burrillville was later adopted and proved to be successful on a statewide basis. One need not go far afield to project a nationwide undertaking with equal success in stamping out once and for all this deadly disease.

The American public must be made to realize that measles has become one of the principal child killers today, and that each year new thousands of children develop penumonia and other serious diseases from measles. Even when fatality does not result, measles leaves in its wake permanent brain damage and a host of behavioral and emotional problems.

National morbidity and mortality records show that some 500 children die annually from measles, and that approximately 4,000 children develop encephalitis and must spend the rest of their lives in homes for the mentally

retarded.

This situation can be remedied. Medical research has already shown us how to prevent this kind of tragedy. The Journal of the American Medical Association, commenting editorially, has stated:

With the development of a safe and effective vaccine. * * * measles and its complications can be virtually eliminated. All that is needed is wide acceptance and diligent use of the available vaccine.

By responding to the expressed will of the American people that good health is no longer the privilege of some, but the right of all our citizens, and by enacting so many key health measures to that end, the first session of this Congress won the designation of the "Health Congress." To live up to that reputation, we can do no less than to move promptly and swiftly to make certain that appropriate measures are taken in our home States to insure the ultimate defeat of measles as a killer and crippler of children.

If Rhode Island, the Nation's smallest State—and I hasten to remind you that this applies only to its geographical area—if Rhode Island can produce heroes and heroines for a statewide campaign to end measles, it behooves all of our States to move in the same direction.

I feel that within many State borders there are other Dr. Ernest J. Smithsphysicians with true pioneer blood-who need only the encouragement of their communities to try something big and new.

Surely, each State has its Dr. Rudolf A. Jaworski and its Dr. James E. Bowes, ready, willing, and eager to mount a similar campaign.

Certainly, there are other nurses whose measure of dedication equals that of my sister-Margaret Fogarty-able to insure the cooperation between local nurses and local doctors for other statewide "end measles" campaigns.

And, finally, given the facts and the reason why, no American citizen can find it in his or her heart to say "No" to workers in such a humanitarian cause.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. GRAY), for Thursday, February 24 through March 4, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Roncalio, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cohelan, for 5 minutes, today. Mr. Fogarty, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. REUSS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Burton of Utah), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. Don H. CLAUSEN in two instances.

Mr. MAILLIARD.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. WIDNALL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Downy.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. MULTER.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. NEDZI.

Mr. McGrath.

Mr. BURKE.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee.

Mr. Morrison.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to: accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 28, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God." has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 89th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (2 U.S.C. 25), approved February 18, 1948: THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, 17th District, New York.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2086. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improvement in supply support for aircraft under the military as sistant program for the Republic of China, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2087. A letter from the Secretary of Hous-ing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2088. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for postaward audits to detect lack of disclosure of significant cost or pricing data available prior to contract negotiation and award, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2089. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on employee personal property claims settled during calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of sections 240-242, title 31, U.S.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2090. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 6, 1966, submitting a report, to-gether with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Washburn Harbor, Wisconsin, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 14, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

2091. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of the status of construction, alteration, or acquisition of public buildings authorized, pursuant to the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 610(a); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUB-LIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12322. A bill to enable cottongrowers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research and promotion to improve the competitive position of, and to expand markets for, cotton; with amendments (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 13037. A bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act so as to provide for more effective development and utilization of the Nation's manpower resources by expending, modernizing, and improving operations under such act at both State and Federal levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Educa-

tion and Labor.
By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota: H.R. 13038. A bill to extend rural mail de-livery service; to the Committee on Post Of-

fice and Civil Service.

H.R. 13039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment, for purposes of the Federal income tax, of the sale or exchange of livestock on account of an adverse weather condition or certain disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania: H.R. 13040. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the

CXII-257-Part 3

acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 13041. A bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 13042. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies af-fected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 13043. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13044. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to impose an import tax on electricity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13045. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 13046. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title: to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:
H.R. 13047. A bill to provide a permanent
special milk program for children; to the
Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO: H.R. 13048. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 13049. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 13050. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13051. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13052. A bill to establish a National Highway Traffic Safety Center to promote research and development activities for high-way traffic safety, to provide financial assist-ance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13053. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the voluntary program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 13054. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 13055. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13056. A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 13057. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 13058. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 13059. A bill to govern further development of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 13060. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 13061. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13062. A bill to amend the Act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for certain members of the police force of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 13063. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize a limited experimental program of insurance for mortgages executed by nonprofit organizations to finance the purchase and rehabilitation of deteriorating or substandard housing for subsequent sale to low-income purchasers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13064. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT: H.R. 13065. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 13066. A bill to strengthen State and local governments, to provide the States with additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 13067. A bill to amend the joint resolution designating June 14 of each year as Flag Day (37 U.S.C. 157) to provide appro-priate recognition of the pledge of allegiance to the flag and its author, Francis Bellamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 13068. A bill authorizing the establishment of meteorological observation stations on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 13069. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 13070. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 13071. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 13072. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien sons and daughters of World War I veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 13073. A bill to amend title II of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to provide that payments received thereunder shall be dis-regarded for certain public assistance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 13074. A bill to provide for the acquisition of the historic home in the Nation's Capital of Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury under President Thomas Jefferson and President James Madison, as an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, and to provide for its preservation as a historic building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13075. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13076. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 13077. A bill to provide for the construction of wells and other facilities necessary to provide a supplemental water supply to the lands of the Mirage Flats Irrigation District, Mirage Flats project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 13078. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13079. A bill to promote the integration of education in the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 13080. A bill to amend the act of January 21, 1929, as it relates to the methods by which certain lands held for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska may be sold, leased, or exchanged; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13081. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 so as to eliminate therefrom certain provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to certain individuals otherwise eligible therefor because of their membership in certain subversive organizations or their prior conviction of crimes involving subversive activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN: H.R. 13082. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor. By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 13083. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and

By Mr. WALKER of Mississippi:

H.R. 13084. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the U.S. aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fish-

H.R. 13085. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, to provide that an indi-vidual under a total disability for 2 months shall be considered "disabled" for benefit and freeze purposes even though the disability is not permanent, and to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits to an individual from the beginning of his disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 13086. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORTON: H.R. 13087. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDADE: H.R. 13088. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 13089. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIDNALL: H.R. 13090. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and

Currency.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 13091. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 849. Joint resolution to require that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 850. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Representative Government Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Con. Res. 596. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI: H. Res. 748. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: H. Res. 749. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 13092. A bill for the relief of William F. Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13093. A bill for the relief of Grady Benefield; to the Committee on the Judi-

By Mr. CORMAN: H.R. 13094. A bill for the relief of Chris G. Ings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 13095. A bill for the relief of Henry Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary. By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 13096. A bill for the relief of Monte H. Walker; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13097. A bill for the relief of Hillary Lockhart; to the Committee on the Judiciary. By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 13098. A bill for the relief of the survivors of Justin E. Burton; to the Committee on the Judiciary. By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13099. A bill for the relief of Ismay Emeline Benn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 13100. A bill for the relief of George Andreopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 13101. A bill for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

334. The SPEAKER presented a petition of John L. Purcell, Los Angeles, Calif., and others, relative to a pension for veterans of World War I, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fino Introduces GOP Demonstration Cities Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation designed to focus attention on part two of the administration's plan to socialize American residential patterns—the "Federal coordinator" called for in the administration's "demonstration cities" legislation.

My bill, in many ways similar to the "demonstration cities" legislation introduced by the administration, contains similar program and financial provisions, but deletes the section calling for a Federal coordinator and substitutes a Federal information officer. The bill also deletes language requiring cities to have a plan for social renovation before they

can qualify for Federal aid. The bill adds a provision stating the sense of Congress that the program is not to detract in any way from the powers of local government to control and administer existing Federal grant-in-aid programs.

This legislation—substituting a Federal information officer for a Federal coordinator-to my mind removes the Federal fishhook from the self-improvement carrot the President is offering to the cities of our Nation. I believe in billions for rebuilding our cities, but I do not believe in spending a cent for the undermining of local government.

I do not believe that Federal aid programs should be the vehicle of social experiments. My bill cuts the "social experiment" angle out of the program. I believe in creative federalism and I support that part of the administration bill encompassed in my bill. I am 100 percent opposed, however, to encroaching centralism as represented by the Federal coordinator, whom I call a commissar for he would be nothing less. My bill is a good bill. It is truly dedicated to rebuilding our cities in accordance with the timeless American tradition of local selfgovernment. The Fino bill takes the encroaching centralism out of the program and leaves the creative federalism. I believe that this is the way to do the job.

Chester W. Nimitz: An American Naval Immortal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 4 days before his 81st birthday, Fleet Adm. Chester William Nimitz died. This Nation, and especially the hundreds of thousands of American servicemen who served under him, now sadly join in a farewell tribute to a great U.S. naval figure. He came from a small town in Texas to eventually command and lead to complete victory the greatest naval force ever assembled on this globe. His service to his country can never be forgotten and his attributes as an American officer will stand always as an example of the finest in a great tradition.

Following his graduation as seventh in a class of 114 in the class of 1905 of the Naval Academy, Admiral Nimitz handled a wide variety of assignments in a meritorious manner. His rise in his chosen career was finally capped by a tour of 2 years-1945-47-as the highest uniformed naval officer in this country. But he will always be remembered as the man who assumed command of the Pacific Fleet in the dark days of December 1941 and who led it to a brilliant victory over Imperial Japan. Combining a great strategic perspective, an eminently successful tactical competence, an ability to get the most from his men, and a resolution to persevere until victory, he led the American naval forces through a series of battles and campaigns to Tokyo Bay in September 1945. He started with a badly hurt fleet and nursed it and built it into the greatest striking force the world has ever seen.

After his outstanding military career he continued his public service in many positions of a private and public character. He always displayed his traits of geniality, humanity, and intelligence in a fashion to do honor to himself and his Nation. He finally retired to his home near San Francisco in 1956. It is with great pride as an American that I extend to his wife and four children my deep respects and sincere condolences on this

sad day.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, it has been 26 years since the illegal seizure of the Baltic nations. In an era when the United Nations is expanding its membership yearly, many people have never learned of Lithuania's history and its tragic fate. Indeed, a sizable percentage of member states was not even in existence when Lithuania fell to Soviet perfidy.

On February 16, we observed the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Lithuanian Americans have led the fight to inform the world of their homeland and of their homeland's loss of freedom. Lithuania is not a makebelieve nation. It has a rich and honorable history going back to the 13th century. The takeover of this small nation stands as a clear example of the expansionist tactics of the Soviet Union and of its indifference to the principles of freedom, democracy, and self-determination.

The United States has refused to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into Russia. We thus reiterate our support for the principle of self-determination and for the moral and political implications of this principle.

I congratulate the Lithuanian-American organizations in the United States for their long and tenacious fight in

behalf of this cause.

One Hundredth Birthday of Millville, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago this Saturday, on February 26, 1866, the pretty city of Millville, in Cumberland County, N.J., held its meeting of incorporation and, during that evening, voted itself out of the "township" classification and into the "city" category. This event is being celebrated Saturday in Millville with a centennial parade and civic banquet.

The parade will be complete with bands, marching units, and floats, and promises to be a highlight of Millville's 100th birthday celebration which officially began on January 10, 1966.

On that day, a reenactment of the first town council meeting ever held in Mill-ville was staged in a town meeting during which residents of Millville donned the costumes current 100 years ago and portrayed the roles of the original participants. It was probably the first town meeting ever held in which the participants received curtain calls.

Saturday's parade is the second in a series of events being staged by the Mill-ville Centennial Corp., to mark the end of the city's first century. On July 4, there is scheduled a gigantic community picnic and fireworks display, and on June 30 through July 2, the formal celebration will conclude with a historical

pageant.

Mr. Speaker, today Millville is known as "the Holly City of America" to note the fact that the traditional Christmas season decoration is grown there in great profusion and provided to holiday time markets throughout the Nation. Millville now has some 20,000 residents and, although it is a relatively small community by some standards, its citizens are looking forward to growth and progress during their city's second century. This spirit is inherent in the manifesto which the Millville Centennial Corp. issued at the beginning of the 100th birthday celebration.

The manifesto states that Millville intends to create new civic awareness among all its citizens, plans to uncover new civic leaders, stimulate the local economy, honor its heritage, and focus its attention on the future.

I might note that two of Amercia's most famous personages have joined in the centennial celebration. The Mill-

ville "Brothers of the Brush," a group of male residents who have grown beards reminiscent of the style of 1866, invited Astronauts Frank Borman and James A. Lovell—whose Gemini V beards became quite widely remarked upon—to accept honorary memberships in Millville's bearded brotherhood, and both accepted.

I cannot help but be proud of the spirit exhibited by Millville's residents—paying honor to yesterday while, at the same time, preparing carefully and systematically for tomorrow. I am proud to help mark the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of this progressive, charming city and look forward to joining with Millville's celebrants Saturday.

The Kuwait National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, February 25 marks the date on which the people of Kuwait will observe their annual National Day. The House will not be in session tomorrow, the actual date of this observance, and I am therefore taking occasion today to extend warm felicitations to His Highness Shaikh Sabah al Salim al Sabah, the Amir of Kuwait; and to the Kuwaiti Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Talat al-Ghousseim.

The celebrations this year will lay emphasis on Kuwait's entering her fifth year as an independent state. All of Kuwait's many friends agree that her accomplishments after only 5 brief years of independence rival, and in some cases even surpass, those of many older members of the international community.

Little is known about Kuwait's early history, but during its modern period one of its most significant acts was the signing of the 1899 agreement with Great Britain. That document gave Kuwait a large degree of internal self-government with British guarantees of her political integrity and guidance in foreign affairs. This relationship ended on June 19, 1961, when Kuwait became a fully independent and sovereign nation. Even the quiet manner of achieving her independence is testimony of the high quality of political leadership found in Kuwait.

Her tremendous supply of oil, the backbone of the economy, has given Kuwait's citizens a per capita income in excess of \$3,000 per year. Crude oil production averaged more than 2.3 million barrels daily in 1964, an increase of 10 percent over 1963. The positive benefits of this national wealth have not been monopolized by a few groups or individuals, but have been shared domestically and through foreign aid. The social services such as free health, education, and public works programs make similar programs in the "advanced" nations blush. Every indication points to the prospect that this trend will con-

tinue at an even greater pace in the future.

As I mentioned earlier, Kuwait has not neglected her responsibilities to assist those countries less fortunate than herself. Through the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development—KFAED—she has offered project development loans totaling in excess of \$105 million through 1964. In addition, other loans totaling more than \$225 million by the end of 1964 were extended to other Arab States.

Under the guidance of His Highness Sabah al-Salim al Sabah Kuwait has played a very active role in international affairs, and has been a dependable participant in such organizations as the United Nations and the Arab League.

I am certain that I echo the sentiments of the entire Congress when I offer congratulations and best wishes to the progressive and hard-working people and Government of Kuwait as they celebrate their national holiday. May their dynamic example of a state truly dedicated to the enrichment and fulfillment of its people serve as an inspiration to other nations who are trying to build their own national destinies.

Nation's Best Minds Advise President Johnson on Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in a recent letter made this historic statement in a personal message:

Whatever else history may say, it must record that everything this Government is trying to do is the result of the collected wisdom and judgment of the best minds in the country. And I alone will take responsibility for all final decisions.

This statement first appeared publicly in my newsletter, Capitol Comments, on February 14, 1966, in which it was pointed out that the Vietnam conflict apparently is entering a significant new phase of reconstruction and pacification.

Under unanimous consent I insert this issue of Capitol Comments in the Congressional Record, believing it to be of interest to my colleagues and to Americans generally.

The newsletter follows:

VIETNAMESE CONFLICT ENTERS NEW STAGE (By JOE L. EVINS)

This week in Washington was marked by major and significant developments in the continuing Vietnamese crisis. The conflict seemingly is moving into a new stage. This became apparent with the recent meeting of President Johnson and other high American officials with officials of the South Vietnamese Government during the week in Honolulu, Hawaii.

Following this meeting a joint declaration was issued in which the goals of the two nations were announced. A concerted effort

will be made to build a democratic nation, beginning at the grassroots level.

According to the announcement, as areas are liberated from the Vietcong, American and Vietnamese teams will move in to launch basic programs, in education, in economic reform, in agriculture, and in health to create stable and self-governing communities.

It is most significant that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Agriculture attended the sessions at Honolulu and then moved on to South Vietnam to begin immediate work on these programs to build free, self-governing, democratic communities.

It is also significant that President Johnson dispatched Vice President HUMPHREY to visit South Vietnam to continue the momentum for this positive program of reconstruction and pacification gained at the session in Hawaii.

The Governments of the United States and South Vietnam agreed on these main points at Honolulu:

To resist aggression.

To work for the social improvement of the people.

To strive for self-government.

To promote free, democratic elections.
To attack hunger, ignorance, and disease.

To continue the quest for peace.

President Johnson is continuing his firm.

reasoned direction of the conflict and there are strong indications that our American forces are inflicting sustained, substantial and telling losses on the Vietcong and on invading Communists.

In response to a letter which your Representative sent to President Johnson concerning the Vietnamese conflict, the President said in reply:

"Whatever else history may say, it must record that everything this Government is trying to do is the result of the collected wisdom and judgment of the best minds in the country. And I alone will take responsibility for all final decisions."

The President has an awesome, lonely, and grave responsibility in safeguarding the interests of freedom and halting the onrush of communism in southeast Asia, and at the same time, avoiding the missteps that would trigger a nuclear war.

The President is moving in the direction of achieving an honorable peace without a general war. There could be no greater responsibility placed upon the shoulders of any man—and the President needs our support in this critical time.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I take note of the 48th anniversary of the independence of Estonia. Estonians all over the world would like to say that their nation continues to be free and independent, but they cannot. On June 17, 1940, the army of the Soviet Union brought that freedom to an end by brute force of arms.

In two short decades Estonia had made marked progress toward the development of a thriving democratic system. Despite the hard times experienced by other democratic states during the period between the Great World Wars,

universal sufferage and democracy triumphed in Estonia. Her economy grew because of a skillful mixture of public and private ownership of the means of production.

As examples of the progress made during independence, area under cultivation rose by 17.5 percent, grain production by 45 percent, milk yield by 67 percent, railway line length from 800 to 1,434 kilometers, and 56,000 more farms were erected as a result of land reform. In 1934, 95.1 percent of the inhabitants of Estonia lived on earned income, the mark of a true democracy. Such progress could have continued through today, but for the aggression of the Soviet Union, in violation of explicit treaty obligations.

Under Soviet occupation the income of the average Estonian fell by 33 percent. An exporter of food before 1940, this valiant nation, thereafter, subsisted at the pleasure of her conquerors. Not only did the people suffer from the lack of food, but they also endured massive extermination and banishment to forced labor camps deep in the Soviet Union.

The sordid record of communism in Estonia is there for all to see. Our country must continue to take interest in the Estonian cause to repair the damage of Soviet occupation and strive toward the reestablishment of a free and independent Estonia.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, Estonia was one of the smallest countries to regain its independence toward the end of the First World War. The country, on the northeastern shores of the Baltic with just over a million inhabitants, had been made part of the Russian empire early in the 18th century, and its people grudgingly endured the oppressive czarist regime of two centuries. In 1917 when the czarist autocracy was overthrown by the Russian revolution, all national groups once subjected to the czarist regime felt free, regained their liberty, and proclaimed their national independence. The Estonians did this on February 24, 1918, and founded the Estonian Republic.

In this newly established small, democratic Republic the sturdy, patriotic, and thrifty Estonians, did wonders in the course of their free existence during the next two decades. Besides rebuilding their war-torn and ravaged country, they made tremendous advances in every phase of their national activity. They were perfectly happy in their beloved homeland. But their happiness short lived. When the Second World War broke out Estonia's independence was threatened. In 1940 the country was overrun by the Red army, occupied, and then made part of the Soviet Union.

Thus ended the freedom of the Estonian people, and since then they have been under totalitarian dictatorship. living With the establishment of the Communist regime there since the end of the war, the unhappy Estonians have been locked up in their country, and are deprived of their freedom. There they endure the abominable yoke of their Communist taskmasters and pray for their eventual liberation. On the 48th anniversary of their independence day we wish them fortitude and patience in their struggle for their freedom and independence.

Supervisor Fred Haight: A Great Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, a very close friend and former colleague of mine, who served the people of Del Norte County for many years, has recently departed from our midst. While many of the Members of Congress were not privileged to know this gentleman, I am, under leave to extend my remarks, taking this opportunity to include comments that I have made that portray the character of one of the great humanitarians and public servants in and for the county of Del Norte, Calif. Mr. Fred Haight literally gave his life to the people of Del Norte County:

SUPERVISOR FRED HAIGHT: A GREAT HUMANITARIAN

Our friend, Fred Haight, has been called to the great beyond. In learning of a friend's passing, one immediately recalls the many events and activities that took place as a result of one's association with that person. I am certain many people in Del Norte County are doing just this very thing.

While Fred Haight was principally known as the supervisor from Smith River and as chairman of the board of supervisors for our beloved Del Norte County, he was affectionately known as "Uncle Fred" to his many friends who knew and loved him. His many deeds, that were most often carried out without fanfare or publicity, will be remembered well into the future. He was in his glory when he was doing things for people—be it his constitutents, his community church, his many friends, and in particular, young people and children.

It was my privilege to serve with Fred Haight on the board of supervisors for many years. We agreed on many issues and we also disagreed, but with each passing year of service, I became better acquainted with "Uncle Fred's" manner of serving his people.

"Uncle Fred's" manner of serving his people.
On the lighter side, a mutual interest in sports, particularly baseball, provided a strong bond between us. For many years, prior to my time, Fred Haight was an outstanding catcher in Del Norte baseball circles. During my pitching days in Crescent City, my former teammates and the faithful Crescent City merchant baseball fans will recall Fred's attendance at every home game. I will always remember that familiar face—typical of a former catcher—sitting behind homeplate watching to see if my curve

would break or if I would throw the pitch that he thought should be thrown.

His genuine interest in road development, agriculture, aviation, county buildings and, in particular, the hospital and humanitarian programs, brought much in the way of social progress to his community and county.

These are but a few of the fond memories that many of us will retain always. I know all of Del Norte County will agree in saying respectfully to Fred Haight's family, "We thank you for sharing this very warm, congenial, and lovable 'country gentleman' with us." He certainly gave his full measure of devotion to the many causes he believed in.

A Clear Voice in the Stormy Sea of American Maritime Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday. February 24, 1966

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 23, 1966, I had the privilege and honor of introducing my distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Honorable Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat, of Maryland, at a luncheon held in his honor by the Propeller Club, Port of Washington. The remarks of Chairman Garmatz on this occasion represent a clear voice in the presently stormy sea of controversy surrounding American maritime policy. It is a call to return to reality and get on with the task of promoting the American maritime industry.

I submit to my colleagues the full text of the remarks of Chairman Garmatz, which are both timely and perceptive in view of the present plight of the American maritime industry.

REMARKS OF HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

Mr. Clark, members of the Propeller Club, Port of Washington, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to appear before the Propeller Club of the Port of Washington.

The Propeller Club was founded to preserve the maritime heritage of our Nation and it is a symbol of our maritime industry and the American merchant marine. I am proud to say that I appear before you as a member—for I have enjoyed membership in the Propeller Club.

It is something more than simply a very genuine pleasure for me to address you today.

The broadly based objectives of the Propeller Club of the United States to promote, further, and support an American merchant marine adequate to meet the requirements of national security and economic welfare of the United States apply to all of the 50 member ports within and without the United States and to the 15 student ports. They are the objectives sought to be fostered by the more than 10,000 dedicated individuals who make up our national membership.

Interest in the furtherance of these objectives is at a high level in all of the constituent ports

And I wish to compliment the national and local leadership that is presently exerting itself to make the Propeller Club an effective force in the vital maritime affairs of our country.

But there is something special about this club—not that there is any greater interest or dedication to our objectives than there is elsewhere.

The something special is due to the unique concentration of representatives here in Washington of virtually every element that goes to make up the great complex of American maritime policy and all of its contributing components.

Just a quick look at a roster of the membership of the port of Washington bears

this out.

From the Government you have many members from most of the executive departments, including, of course, the numerous bureaus and agencies within such departments.

You have vice presidents and other high officials of most of the leading shipping and shipbuilding companies.

The major maritime trade associations are well represented.

Maritime labor is widely represented.

There are naval architects, steamship agents, leading manufacturers' representatives, and lawyers galore. You have beauteous lady members, Madeleine Carroll, and Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan.

So, it is a special privilege, and I believe very fitting, that I should appear before you today to make what is virtually my maiden speech since election to the chairmanship of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I am greatly pleased to see so many members of the committee here today.

I am looking forward to the coming years, and I am here to give you my pledge that I will do all in my power to carry out our national maritime policy and vigorously foster the objectives of the Propeller Club of the United States.

Although I have seen written reports that I am slanted in one way or another, I can promise you that my efforts will be directed in behalf of the overall good for the American merchant marine.

In my 18 years in Congress I have never witnessed a period when our national maritime policy has been the subject of so much uncertainty and confusion. Notwithstanding a clear statutory statement of policy, with a full set of implementing guidelines, we seem to be not only without a propeller, but apparently without rudder and helmsman as well.

At a time when the Soviet Union is expanding the size of its merchant fleet at a faster rate than any other nation of the world, the American merchant marine is experiencing a record decline.

I am concerned about the confusion and uncertainty that exists and I am concerned about the steady decline of this country as a maritime power.

It seems to me extremely shortsighted for this country to allow such a situation to exist and continue.

Our maritime industry should be a major and vibrant part of our economy; it is essential not only to our national defense—as the Vietnam conflict has once again proved—but to our commerce. If properly promoted, the merchant marine could by itself overcome our adverse balance of international payments.

Let us look at a few facts.

It is indeed ironic that the present budget calls for only 13 new vessels during the fiscal year 1967. In 1964, when 100 new merchant vessels were delivered to the Soviet Union, only 16 new vessels were delivered for United States registry.

A little over a year ago, the Soviet Union had 464 merchant vessels under contract in shipyards, including 111 tankers. As of the same date, the United States had only 39 new vessels under contract, including 1 tanker.

At the present time, the United States—the major power of the world and by far

the world's major trading nation—ranks 12th in new vessel construction.

We rank behind such countries as Argentina, Brazil, Finland, and Peru.

For a nation whose growth and greatness have come from seapower, can these facts be other than alarming?

I have always considered that our basic

maritime policy is sound.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, we have developed the world's most efficient and most modern liner fleet—even though inadequate in numbers. The detailed provisions of this act, however, have not been adequate to promote strong bulk carrier and tanker segments of our merchant marine.

Succeeding Administrations have failed to seek the necessary implementing legislation or administer that which has been provided.

I would not attempt to contend that any statute, in the face of changing time should

remain unaltered for 30 years.

And we can have a more realistic program for assisting American-flag bulk carriers and tankers, without at the same time destroying that part of the act which has been successful. Some new legislation may be needed. Let us have it and we will act on it.

At a time when we should be considering a positive program for broadening the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to extend its benefits to all segments of the American merchant marine, we are floundering on the sea of uncertainty.

At a time when our domestic shipbuilding program should be at its peak, the present budget proposes a program that is the all-

time low.

I am tired of reading analyses of the Interagency Maritime Task Force Report, or of the Report of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee. The business of our committee is legislation, and without a legislative program to consider, we are left to theorize like everyone else.

I am confident that President Johnson aims to dispel the atmosphere of despair that now prevails in our maritime program, as he has done in other areas. The picture is not

entirely bleak.

Our country has the world's only nuclearpowered merchant vessel, the NS Savannah.

We are on the verge of a technological breakthrough in the field of nuclear propelled commercial vessels, and the time is ripe for us to begin the second phase of our nuclear ship program.

The United States has the world's best, the most modern, and most productive liner fleet—but we need more such vessels in private ownership to serve our complex society and the uncertain but demanding needs of war.

With assistance in vessel research similar to that of the American aircraft industry, I am convinced that our domestic shipyards could become competitive with foreign shipbuilders.

Lastly, but most importantly, most segments of maritime labor have tried to be reasonable and realistic in accepting reduced manning requirements resulting from automation.

There is virtually no industry in this country that is not subsidized either directly or indirectly through some protective measures. The American merchant marine is not unique in the assistance that it requires. Our economy has been able to flourish with the highest standard of living in the world as the greatest trading Nation because our industries with governmental assistance have been able to become the most productive industries in the world.

Recent technological developments in ship design, propulsion equipment, shipbuilding, and cargo handling signify that a major technological breakthrough is imminent. Increased productivity is now possible in the maritime industry as never before. Automation programs are reducing the impact of the differential between higher American-flag labor costs and foreign costs.

We are at a critical time when we must move forward with a program to promote all segments of our American merchant marine and our domestic shipyards so that these industries can achieve maximum productivity in our economy. There appears to be every hope that with such a realistic and positive program, subsidy cost to the Government will eventually be reduced, rather than increased.

Our committee is most anxious to cooperate with the administration in any constructive new maritime program that will be presented.

Unfortunately, perhaps, too much emphasis has been placed on focusing on the revolutionary proposals in the Interagency Maritime Task Force report, rather than recognizing that in principle very few people disagree on what should be the main ingredients of a sound maritime program. For example, everyone agrees that:

1. We must build more vessels for opera-

tion under the American flag;

We must develop a realistic program for assisting American-flag bulk carriers and tankers;

- 3. Government interference with the steamship industry should be minimized and management should in most cases be free to exercise its own prudent business judgment;
- Subsidies should be to the greatest possible extent direct rather than indirect; and
 Our subsidy program should contain an element of incentive.

These principles form the basis for developing a sound new and expanded maritime program.

I do not agree with the proposal that we should permit vessels under this program to be built abroad. Such a step would, in my opinion, be inconsistent with the best interests of our country and our economy, and would have an extremely detrimental effect on our international balance of payments.

I am hopeful that the Administration will not recommend such a proposal as a part of

the new program.

Similarly, I do not agree with those who would seek to abandon our cargo preference laws.

Such proposals emanate from theoreticians who have no real interest in the American Merchant Marine. Foreign-flag merchant marines have too many built-in and hidden nationalistic advantages and too many preferences of their own for us to consider it realistic at this time to repeal our cargo preference provisions.

On the other hand, as new efficient bulk carrier vessels are constructed for American-flag operation, and—if they are paid a direct operating subsidy—the differential in rates for the carriage of cargo in American-flag bulk carriers as opposed to foreign-flag bulk carriers should be largely eliminated.

Again, I am hopeful that the Administration will not recommend that we abandon our cargo preference statutes.

I also do not agree with those who would contend that we should completely do away with the essential trade route program.

It seems to me that this program is sound and that it has worked well. Perhaps some modifications could be made so as to allow the operators increased flexibility—but I believe that there must be the assurance that adequate American-flag service will be available on each essential trade route to meet our goals and commitments around the world and build our national economy in all areas of the country.

Insofar as passenger vessels are concerned, I am convinced that they are necessary as a part of our American Merchant Marine for national defense reasons and for economic and social reasons as well. More and more people of the world are beginning to travel. The great percentage of these people prefer to travel by surface transportation. There is a great untapped market that is available for ocean transportation services.

I believe that this country must take steps to encourage the construction of several large capacity, low-fare superliners that will place ocean transportation within the economic means of the major part of our great society.

ciety.
In short, I am enthusiastic that we can build upon the framework of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and develop a new, farreaching program to promote all segments of the American Merchant Marine. I am most certainly optimistic.

The progress of our Nation has been one of steady development and evolution—we cannot destroy what we already have, but must use what is good to plan and create our programs for the future. This is the essence of the Great Society, and I am confident that its logic will soon be applied to the maritime industry.

Yesterday was George Washington's birthday. He was a man of great wisdom. He knew that history is eloquent in demonstrating that any nation which takes the easy way of permitting its commerce to be carried by foreign-flag ships—which rents the service and space it is too lazy or too shortsighted to provide, is embarked on a policy of dependency that has ended every time with the nation in question becoming a second-rate power.

Washington knew this truth and warned against its neglect. In closing, I would like to quote the words of George Washington:

"We should not overlook the tendency of war to abridge the means, and thereby at least enhance the price, of transporting productions to their proper markets. I recommend it to your (Congress') serious reflections how far and in what mode it may be expedient to guard against embarrassments from these contingencies by such encouragement to our own navigation as will render our commerce and agriculture less dependent on foreign bottoms which may fail us in the very moments most interesting to both these great objects * * *. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure."

This Is My Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, during my service in the U.S. Congress, I have tried to keep the people I am honored to represent informed of my activities and record in Congress, as well as the policies of the Federal Government. In my years here, some 16,000 bills have been voted on in the House of Representatives. Along with others of us, my record has been on several occasions misrepresented by falsehood and half-truths from the mouths of selfish special-interest groups and political opponents. I here spread my voting on the issues, that each person may determine for himself that my record has been made in the interest of the people.

I voted for the tax reduction bills, which have encouraged industrial and business expansion and produced more jobs. Three substantial tax reductions have been enacted during my service, and each had my full support.

I consistently vote for an invincible national defense, and oppose every proposal to weaken our Nation through unilateral disarmament. I believe our fighting men should have the best possible equipment in ample supply. I will continue working to that end.

I voted for the bill to prevent and control the pollution of waters, and to provide for the development of our water

and land resources.

I voted for the bills relating to community health services, and to provide for the development of programs to help the aging, and to provide for health research facilities.

I opposed the act which causes higher consumer price for coffee.

I voted for increased social security benefits, disability benefits, and increases in old age pensions and other assistance.

I voted to reduce the voluntary retirement age to 62, and for widows, to age 60, and to allow greater earnings before reduction in social security benefits.

I voted for education and training benefits for veterans, and for other GI benefits.

I voted to improve the Railroad Retirement Act.

I voted to provide more educational opportunities for our young people, and to provide loans to students. I have assisted the schools and colleges in our district in their applications for funds and loans amounting to many millions of dollars, and have successfully assisted them in their other problems with the Federal Government.

I have successfully introduced and enacted bills to ban pornography from the mails, and to allow prosecution of purveyors of pornography in the jurisdiction where deliveries are made, and have supported other bills to protect decent people from this obnoxious traffic. I continue to oppose distribution of Communist propaganda through our post offices.

I have introduced and supported bills to strengthen the criminal laws of this country, so that people might be safe on

the streets.

I have responded to every request from a community for assistance in its economic development and in its dealings with the Federal Government. This has resulted in a large number of grants and loans for hospitals, water and sewer systems, libraries, housing, airports and airport construction, remodeling of public buildings, new post offices, public facilities, and countless other improvements.

I have aided numerous industries and businesses that are locating in our district, or expanding their operations in our district, in their applications for loans and other assistance from the Federal level. Our growth in this respect has far exceeded the expansion in any

other comparable area.

At times, cities and businesses have come to me for help after losing hope of success, and I have succeeded in getting favorable action.

I have helped thousands of individuals, including farmers, businessmen, labor, veterans, housewives, the aged, disabled and dependent persons in presenting their claims and problems to the various departments of the Government. I regard this opportunity of service as a privilege, and among my most treasured possessions are the letters of appreciation which I have received from these people who have contacted me after all other hope of receiving help or consideration had been exhausted.

In fact, an ex-Congressman who lives in our district, and his son, a State senator, not knowing what to do, refer to me problems which they consider hopeless, or too much trouble to bother with, because they know of my success and effectiveness in championing the causes of the people. They know I am eager to attain all that our district and our people are entitled to, and that I will continue to fight after the weak and lazy give up. I am one who does not mind working long hours every day for the cause of right.

I voted against the proposals to loan money to Russia and other Communist countries. I consistently vote against giving assistance or aid to the Communist countries through foreign aid gifts, or otherwise.

I voted for the proposal which would have denied foreign aid gifts to any country which is trading with or aiding North Vietnam in any way. I am strictly against lending aid or comfort to our enemies in any way.

I consistently vote to save many billions of dollars by cuts in foreign aid, in various excessive departmental budgets, and other unnecessary and wasteful spending. All waste and extravagance should be eliminated, and fiscal responsibility practiced.

I actively support amendments to the Trade Agreement Act to protect farmers, cattlemen, labor, and oil, mineral and other industries from imports from lowwage and slave-wage countries, which are so harmful to domestic producers and American labor.

As the result of investigation by a subcommittee of which I am chairman, I prevented the destruction of the homes of thousands of low-income families, most of whom were Negroes. Those people came to me in desperation, and I am humbly proud of their resolutions which have commended our successful effort to save their homes and businesses from despoilers who sought their homes for private profit in the name of urban renewal.

I voted for the bill to eliminate the provisions of the Railway Act, which had been reducing the annuities of the wives of retired employees.

I voted for the bill to regulate and control exports to Communist countries.

I voted for the bills to provide loan insurance and supplementary direct loans to assist students to attend business, trade, and vocational schools: to provide loans for college students; to provide vocational schools to train the unskilled for better jobs; and to provide for needed medical library services.

I voted for a "clean elections" proposal which would have provided penalties for illegal voting.

I voted for the proposal which would have required apportionment of summer jobs in Government, so each district would have its proportionate share.

I voted for the bills to increase the pay for members of the armed services. I voted for the bill for cost-of-living increases for civil service retirees.

I voted for the bills to build good roads and highways, which have resulted in the hundreds of miles of highways and farm-to-market roads which have been built and are now being constructed in the counties of our district, and which will bring us more and better roads as fast as construction is possible.

I voted against liberalizing our immigration laws, feeling that increased immigration will take jobs away from our citizenry, and increase our welfare

I voted for cost of living increases in disability compensation. It had not been raised since 1933.

I voted for the resolution in opposition to the intervention of international communism in the Western Hemisphere. I oppose treasonable inroads of communism in our country and in our hemi-

I voted for authority to make or insure loans to nonprofit groups to establish water systems and sewer systems for rural areas.

I introduced a bill to restore the right to have voluntary prayer and Bible reading in school. I believe the Supreme Court, in forbidding this time-honored custom, violates the constitutional guarantee that there should be no law which interferes with religious freedom.

I vote against any bill which would destroy the freedom we enjoy in America. I do not believe American citizens are ready or willing to surrender their liberty to a dictatorial centralized gov-

As chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I conducted an investigation which resulted in revoking a license which had been granted to a society of homosexuals to solicit charitable funds to promote their society. I do not believe any branch of government should lend its sanction to such an abomination.

I voted for Congress to control the purse strings, and against back-door raids on the Public Treasury.

I voted for the minimum wage bill, and to adjust the salaries of civil service and postal employees.

I voted against recognizing Red China. and for preserving our treaty rights in the Panama Canal Zone and in Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba.

I voted for control of drugs, and to tighten our internal security laws.

During my congressional service, more money has come into our district from Washington, by millions of dollars, than has gone from our district in Federal taxes. In this way and others I have exerted my efforts to develop our district.

It was upon my request that Congress appropriate the money for the survey

for the development of the Trinity River Basin, which subsequently resulted in the authorization of that project, and appropriations to carry it on. I actively supported similar survey and development of the Sabine, Neches, and Angelina River basins. I was instrumental in obtaining approval of the projects for the Attoyac and San Jacinto Rivers.

I worked effectively to obtain funds for the construction of Rayburn Dam at McGee Bend on the Angelina River, and to secure congressional approval for the Toledo Bend Dam. The enhancement of the economy of the areas involved is already apparent to the extent that some who opposed these developments now seek to claim credit for them. We have now built the base, and our strides forward will rapidly accelerate.

I introduced bills to set aside part of Federal income tax revenues to each State to aid education without Federal control, and to provide additional income tax exemptions for students and their parents, to be known as the Education

Incentive Act.

As a member of the powerful Judiciary Committee, it has been my privilege to give unceasing support to the right to own private property, the free enterprise system, to the preservation of liberty and individual freedom, and the other Godgiven rights and privileges of American citizenship.

I oppose deficit spending, and vote against the annual increase in the national debt. Fiscal responsibility demands that the Government live within its income. A day of accounting must come, and the longer it is delayed, the

harder it will be to face.

I supported the bill to provide protection for union members and the public from exploitation, racketeering and embezziement, and to give rank and file members a proper voice in union affairs, and to guarantee honest elections of officers.

I voted for the accelerated public works appropriation, which has brought many millions of dollars to our district.

I voted for the bill to promote the coordination and development of outdoor recreation, and to bring tourists to our district.

I voted for the bill to assist the States in providing additional research facilities

at experimental stations.

I vote to retain legislative authority in Congress, and continually and consistently oppose the surrender of these powers to the Executive, as being dangerous to the people. I support local control of local affairs, and oppose all attempts to impose Federal domination.

I support separation of church and

state.

I believe in local control of our schools, and oppose Federal control over education.

I support and vote for bills to guarantee local and States rights, as well as individual rights, from being usurped by the Supreme Court. The Constitution does not give legislative authority to the Court.

I support REA, in order that farm homes may have electricity and telephones.

I support FHA and other such loan programs, so that more people will be able to own their homes.

I voted for the use of farm surplus foods to assist needy Americans. I believe we should take care of our own, instead of giving away everything we have to foreign nations. Charity begins at home.

I vote against proposals to impose bureaucratic controls over individuals and localities. Such controls destroy the God-given freedoms which have made us a great nation.

I vote for the school lunch program and the milk program for children, in order that our young people may have

proper nourishment.

I voted for legislation to preserve small business institutions and free competitive enterprise, and for the bills to take the Government out of competition with private business.

I support the bills to require uniform procurement practices in the Armed Forces, to eliminate duplication, waste,

and exhorbitant prices.

I vote for the antitrust laws, to preserve competition and to secure equal opportunities for all persons to compete in trade or business.

I was a leader in the fight which restored the tidelands to Texas, after the Supreme Court had attempted to deprive us of the property we had dedicated to our schools.

I voted for the bill which would have protected State laws from the whims of the members of the Supreme Court.

I vote to keep intact the Texas national forests. Proceeds from timber sales help support school districts and county governments, making tax rates lower for individuals.

I voted to increase personal and dependency exemptions for income tax purposes, and introduced a bill to raise the exemption from \$600 to \$1,000. Increased cost of living would justify this action on the part of Congress.

I voted to outlaw the Communist Party, and to prohibit Communists from serving in representative capacities.

I supported the proposal to grant aid for the construction of nursing homes and health services for the aged and the chronically ill.

I supported the program to provide more trained teachers for deaf children.

I support the programs for conservation of soil, water, and other resources, and for the flood control.

I voted for legislation to increase the salaries of the teachers under our jurisdiction, and was chairman of the House conference in a joint conference committee with the Senate which successfully accomplished this increase.

I voted for the bill to provide legal assistance to indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts.

I voted to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of social security benefits, and to provide social security benefits for the disabled.

I vote for the people and against the alien philosophies which are adverse to the interests of America, by whatever name their adherents may call themselves.

I voted to guarantee the right of trial by jury in Federal courts.

The above list could be multiplied, but may be summed up by saying that I supported a realistic foreign policy, based on America's interests, rather than trying to "buy" friends. I vote for economy in Government, curbs on inflation, and for military procurement by competitive bid to save billions for the taxpayers. I oppose unwise, wasteful spending, high taxes, and the huge public debt which mortgages our children's future.

I support the right to own property, even if it is merely the clothes I wear. The disciples of the socialistic alien thought, who say I vote wrong, and who are trying to purge me from Congress, would deny to any of us the right to own our property, little though it may be.

This is my record. The socialists do not like it, but I do not believe Americans are yet ready to accept socialism as a way of life for freedom-loving people.

By regular visits to every county in our district, I make myself available for the personal services I can render individual citizens in their problems and contacts with the Federal Government and its agencies. Through regular questionnaires, letters, and personal contacts, I am able to ascertain the wishes of the people of our district in regard to pending legislation and national issues, in order to be a true representative of the people, rather than the rubberstamp of out-of-State pressure groups.

More Flags for Vietnam: Nations Supporting the U.S. Effort in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the United States is not the only country assisting South Vietnam in its struggle against conquest by its northern neighbor. Although we wish more substantial assistance were being provided by more nations, we should not overlook the valuable military, economic, or sometimes political and moral support which has been rendered by other nations. We should not forget which nations are willing to stand up and be counted on our side.

Three nations have made the supreme commitment of sending troops, and risking the lives of their sons for the cause of freedom just as the United States and the Republic of Vietnam must do. These nations are Australia, which has sent one reinforced battalion of 1,500 men; New Zealand, which has sent one artillery battery of 300 men; and the Republic of Korea, which has sent a reinforced division of 17,000 men and supporting forces totaling 3,750 men. Other military assistance has been provided by Malaysia, which has supplied training to Vietnamese for counterinsurgency operations and some armored vehicles; the Philippines and Nationalist China, which have sent psychological warfare as well as medical personnel; and Thailand, which has military air detachments in Vietnam and supplies training for South Vietnamese Air Force personnel.

In addition to these countries which are sending military assistance, more than 30 nations are supplying or have agreed to supply some sort of nonmilitary assistance. In most cases this support signifies an affirmation of their support for the struggle against agression. Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Israel, Laos, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Spain, Turkey, and Uruguay have sent medicines and flood-relief aid. Canada has provided educational assistance medicines. flour, and aluminum warehouses. Western Germany has provided assistance for agricultural development, physicians, technicians, and ambulances. Iran has sent petroleum products and Ireland has provided financial support. Japan has sent economic assistance, technicians, medical supplies, radios, and ambulances, although it holds the Japanese Constitution prohibits sending troops. Laos has provided refugee relief. The United Kingdom has provided financial assistance, and Venezuela is sending rice. Even traditionally neutral Switzerland has provided 30 microscopes.

In total, 31 nations have supplied some sort of tangible assistance. Eight more have agreed to provide assistance of some

There is another kind of support which has been provided which I would like to mention, and that is political and moral support. For many years the United Kingdom, as a cochairman of the Geneva Conference of 1954, has supported the

support. For many years the Officer Kingdom, as a cochairman of the Geneva Conference of 1954, has supported the basic policies of the United States when the other cochairman, the Soviet Union, sought to issue messages condemning United States or South Vietnamese policy. Similarly Canada, as a member of the International Control Commission, has repeatedly helped protect the free world interests against unfair charges by the Communist side. Other nations have voiced support in important resolutions in international or regional organizations such as the United Nations or SEATO.

All of these contributions have been welcome and appreciated. Nevertheless, in view of the magnitude and importance of the task in South Vietnam, we have every right to ask for more.

Survey of the Atlantic Alliance in the Milwaukee Journal's Great Decisions Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the excellent traditions of the Milwaukee Journal is the yearly series of articles

published in its Sunday editorial section on the "Great Decisions" confronting the Nation. Last Sunday, February 20, the future of the Atlantic alliance was the subject of this series.

Eric Waldman, professor of political science and director of the Institute of German Affairs at Marquette University in Milwaukee, contributed a succinct yet comprehensive survey of the political and military problems of NATO. Professor Waldman is a leading expert on this subject.

In the other article, I outlined my view of a hopeful trend in the Atlantic alliance on matters involving the Common Market, trade, aid, and international monetary reform.

I include the articles hereafter:

GREAT DECISIONS, 1966: WESTERN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES—EUROPE WEATHERS TEMPESTS—BRIGHTER SKIES PREDICTED

(Note.—The two articles below relate to the third week's topic in the Great Decisions series, which poses the question: "End of the Atlantic Alliance?")

(By Representative HENRY S. REUSS)

Crisis is the normal state of affairs for the Atlantic alliance. Prophets of doom saw the end coming when President de Gaulle blocked Great Britain's entry into the Common Market in January 1963; when the multilateral nuclear force (MLF) proposal was sunk almost without trace at the end of 1964; when the Common Market went into shock a year ago. The glorious alliance, the grand design, and the free world community have all been pronounced dead. My reaction is like that of Mark Twain when reports of his death were brought to him. The reports seem greatly exaggerated.

If the United States can take its eyes off the cobra stare fixation of southeast Asia long enough to get on with the task of rebuilding the Atlantic community, the happy Marshall plan days of unity can be here

again.

Today I see some brighter colors across the whole spectrum of transatiantic cooperation in economic, political and military mat-

1. An outward-looking Common Market: The United States from the beginning supported the continental Common Market on the premise that it could be widened to include all of Western Europe; that it would pursue outward-looking, rather than narrow nationalistic policies; that the economic prosperity which it engendered could spin off to the rest of Europe and the world.

We placed particular reliance on two supranational aspects. The Common Market commission, an international body with the sole power of initiating common action, and the end of the system of one member veto, taking effect this year, by which one dog in the manger Common Market member could drag the others down to its level.

President de Gaulle announced some time ago that he was out to wreck both these provisions. But when the smoke of battle cleared from the meeting of the Common Market ministers at Luxembourg late last month, the five—Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg—stood fast. If they continue to stick to their guns, a Common Market which will be outward looking, and which others can join, again becomes a hopeful possibility.

PAYMENTS GAP SHRINKS

2. World trade: The Common Market crisis cast a pall over the Kennedy round negotiations at Geneva, which have to be completed by June 1967. The American position as set forth in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is to achieve a significant reduction of trade barriers on a multilateral basis. Had

France succeeded in bending the Common Market to its will, the chance of meaningful negotiations would have dwindled.

Now we need to press full speed ahead with Kennedy round negotiations. Our first line of attack should be to attempt an across-the-board negotiation with all of the 65 negotiating countries, which between them account for 82 percent of world trade.

But if France should become intransigent, we must not let the entire negotiation fail because of it. As an alternative fallback position, we should make clear our readiness to negotiate with the other 64 countries, accounting for 77 percent of world trade. An intransigent France should be denied the most-favored-nation treatment benefits of such a resulting 65-nation trade liberalization agreement.

tion agreement.

Incidentally, discreet rattling of this "secret weapon" would itself be the best guarantee of a more cooperative France at the bargaining table.

3. International monetary reform: The historian will record with regret that the United States did not move vigorously in the early sixtles to bring its international payments into rough balance, and to embark upon a long overdue reform of the international monetary system.

For years we allowed our payments deficit to hover around the \$3 billion mark, and we proceeded to lose gold—and control over our domestic economy—in the process. Worse, because our payments were still badly out of balance, the countries of Europe were not ready to undertake monetary reform.

In 1965 we have done much better. Our payments deficit is down to some \$1.3 billion. And early this month we tabled before the Group of 10—the leading financial nations of the Atlantic community—our proposal to create a composite reserve unit which can, to some extent, supplement gold and the dollar as the free world's monetary mechanism. There is much negotiating still to do before agreement is reached. But at least we have started.

4. Development aid: While the Atlantic countries have been growing richer every year, the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are making little progress, and in many cases are growing poorer.

Recently hopeful signs have appeared that the developed world is recognizing its joint responsibility toward the developing countries

The House of Representatives this month passed the bill to set up an Asian Development Bank, in which the 19 developing countries of Asia will join with the Atlantic countries to provide long-term economic aid to Asia.

In addition to the United States, Germany, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and nine other European countries have made generous contributions. France alone is conspicuous by its absence.

Together with the Inter-American Development Bank for Latin America, and with the new African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank can channel help on a multilateral basis to where it is desperately needed.

5. Military security: France's removal of most of her military power from NATO command, and her insistence on a separate nuclear striking force, have damaged the NATO structure. But the central idea of one for all and all for one in the military defense of Europe remains. If the Soviet Union is to be persuaded to act with restraint, and if a beginning to discussions for German unification and a more humane order in middle Europe is sought, most leaders realize, the West must stick together.

France may, if she wishes, insist that the United States remove her European supply line from France's soil. If she did, we could set up more direct supply lines to our troops in Germany through north European ports,

incidentally achieving some savings on our balance-of-payments expenditures. Life could still go on.

UPGRADING THE OECD

If President de Gaulle wants NATO headquarters removed from France, there are other places in Europe where it could be installed. And Secretary McNamara's proposal for a continuous consultative procedure on nuclear arms for the NATO alliance seems a far more satisfactory approach than the illfated multilateral nuclear force, which aroused apprehension of a possible German finger on the nuclear trigger.

6. Improved institutions: Attempts over the years since NATO was formed in 1949 to put political and economic flesh on its military bones have been unsuccessful. But there is another organization in being which, with a little beefing up, could provide a truly dynamic institution for Atlantic cooperation. This is the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development,

created in 1961.

OECD's purpose is to achieve full employment without inflation in its member countries, to contribute to the economic expansion of developing countries, and to expand world trade on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis. Its members include the United States and Canada, almost all the European countries including the neutrals, and Japan—generally, the advanced countries of the free world.

The trouble is that the OECD today lacks the prestige and the independence to initiate common solutions for the free world's problems of trade, aid, payments, and economic growth. Its decisionmaking body, the council, only infrequently holds meetings at which its members are represented by high ranking, ministerial level officials. And it lacks a genuine executive agency, such as the Common Market's commission, as well as a consultative legislative assembly.

President Johnson could give Atlantic cooperation a forward surge by calling for a three point upgrading of the OECD; permanent ministerial level representation on its council; an independent executive commis-sion, perhaps of five "wise men," to initiate proposals and make recommendations to the council; and a parliamentary assembly of legislators drawn from the legislative bodies of the member nations to debate and make recommendations concerning the central business of the OECD.

NATO'S ILLNESS: DIAGNOSES DIFFER (By Eric Waldman)

The well-publicized troubles of the Western defense alliance have given some support to the view that "NATO is dead"at least in its terminal illness. According to this line of thought, the crisis in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization does not involve mere organizational difficulties or differences of strategic opinion, but is the sign of an irreversible disintegration process. Therefore, in 1969 when the North Atlantic Treaty expires, the alliance formed 17 years ago to build a powerful collective deterrent against further Soviet expansion in Europe will actually come to an end.

These pessimistic views about the future of NATO call for an examination of some of the major factors which brought on the

current crisis.

One of the most important points at issue is the question of the continuing need for an Atlantic collective security system. Some observers feel that NATO has outlived its usefulness because of the fundamental changes in Soviet foreign policy toward the West.

While the relatively hard Soviet position on Vietnam has clouded the picture somewhat, those who argue that NATO is obsolete

point to the restraint which the Soviet Union has exercised for some time in dealing with the Western Powers as proof of the peaceful coexistence policy. They believe that the cold war has ended with a relaxation of tensions in Europe and that a costly military alliance is no longer required.

Exponents of this view would see merit, in fact, in a complete breakup of NATO, since they feel it would further accelerate finding solutions to some of the still unsolved problems of European unity and security, such as final treaty arrangements between the World War II victors and Germany.

A diametrically opposed analysis holds that there is no substantial change of long range Soviet intentions and that it was and still is the strength of NATO's deterrent power which prevented the Soviet Union from pursuing a more aggressive policy toward the

West.

Champions of this interpretation of the situation in Europe can point at the approximately 90 Soviet divisions stationed in central and eastern Europe, the 3,000 modern tactical aircraft ready for immediate employment, and the 800 medium-range ballistic missiles equipped with nuclear warheads and pointed at West European targets as strong indications of a continuing danger from the East. It is explained that a decrease in the deterrent power of NATO, or its complete disintegration, would result in a revival of Soviet aggressiveness as in the immediate post-World War I era.

DE GAULLE'S IDEAS

That U.S. policymakers give much weight to this view is evident from the continued presence of more than 300,000 men of the American Armed Forces in Europe, including about 220,000 in West Germany and 6,000 in Berlin. This is half again as many American troops as are fighting the hot war thus far in Vietnam.

An entire complex of problems has been thrust upon NATO by the French chief of state. President de Gaulle's policies and actions are strongly influenced by the follow-

ing concepts:

His notion of an expanding "European Europe" from the Atlantic to the Urals requires a disintegrated Eastern Europe, which he suggests could only become reality if

preceded by a similar process in the West. France is destined to be the leading continental power and therefore British and American influence must be curtailed in

Europe.

Germany must not be permitted to share in any nuclear arrangement since this would result in strong Soviet reaction detrimental to easing of control in Eastern Europe and would challenge France's superiority on the Continent.

Since the "nation state" is the primary historical and political unit, integration, or subordination as De Gaulle prefers to call it, is contrary to a nation's interest and has to be opposed. This concept applies equally to NATO, to the European Common Market (EEC), and to other European or-

No nation can indefinitely rely on another country's nuclear power for its own security. France, therefore, must have its own force de frappe. De Gaulle realizes that the limited French nuclear potential (it is estimated that France may have 3 percent of the West's nuclear weapon power by 1970) cannot compete with the nuclear might of the Soviet Union, therefore he insists on the strategic concept of immediate massive retaliation directed against major cities as a deterrent against aggression.

The broad scope of De Gaulle's policies makes it possible for many observers, including American experts on Europe, to agree with one or more of his views and at the same time strongly reject others.

The official U.S. view opposes De Gaulle's position and favors further steps toward European and Atlantic military integration as necessary for an effective Western security system.

Washington appears greatly annoyed by the doubts expressed by Europeans—and the French are by no means the only ones-that the United States would commit its nuclear forces in the case of a Soviet attack in Europe. Neither repeated pledges made by American Presidents and Secretaries of State, nor the American forces sent to Europe in past wars, have convinced all our European partners of our credibility.

Nor do some admit the futility of a nuclear deterrent of the size France can maintain.

A French atomic strike, American strategists warn, would fail to hurt substantially the Soviet retaliatory capability and therefore could only serve to trigger total destruction to its user.

The United States, sympathizes with those NATO partners, including West Germany, which want to participate in nuclear decision making related to the defense of their own countries. The ill fated multilateral force (MLF) was an American attempt to provide for this participation in a small fraction of the available nuclear forces without giving up final United States control on their employment. However the scheme met with only lukewarm support in Western Europe and bitter opposition from the Soviet Union. The recently created nuclear planning committee may prove a more acceptable means to provide the NATO partners with the status of nuclear consultants.

Recently efforts have been made to update NATO strategy and to provide the means for a flexible response to Soviet aggression. The doctrine of massive retaliation, the exchange of the most destructive nuclear weapons whatever the provocation, had lost its credibility. But the failure of the NATO countries, except the United States and West Germany, to supply adequate conventional forces has kept the means for flexible response below desired

STRATEGIC JUSTIFICATION

Despite all the difficulties enumerated, the U.S. administration clearly considers the continuation of NATO still essential to its own and Western Europe's security. Efforts will continue to find a basis of cooperation with all NATO countries, including France, even though at times it appears a frustrating endeavor.

The strategic view that the nation's military policy must be based not on the attitude of a potential opponent as it appears at the moment, but must consider his capability (which does not change so rapidly), seems to be the justification for persistent United States efforts to help NATO survive its recurrent crises.

Over 1,300 Southeastern Louisiana College Students at Hammond, La., Support President Johnson's Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a resolution signed by over 1,300 students at Southeastern Louisiana College in my hometown of Hammond, La., supporting this country's policy in Vietnam. I have forwarded this resolution to President Lyndon B. Johnson to show the President and the entire country how these many young people are patriotically supporting the United States in its struggle in South Vietnam.

The students at Southeastern strongly support their President's policy. In addition to this resolution they sent a similar resolution with a large number of signatures to our troops in Vietnam before Christmas. I feel that these young people represent the finest tradition of our American heritage. I am sure that the sentiments expressed in the resolution represent the views of an overwhelming majority of our citizens throughout the country.

The following is the resolution sponsored by the Southeastern Louisiana College student government and signed by the hundreds of students at that institu-

Whereas the United States of America is involved in a military conflict in Vietnam; and

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson is Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces; and

Whereas the American foreign policy is being applied to its best effect in Vietnam: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the student government of Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond, La., representing the entire student body. go on record as being in full support of our Federal Government's policy in Vietnam; be it further

Resolved, That this body honor the men in Vietnam by rising for a moment in silent prayer; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be recorded in the official minutes of the student government senate and that a copy be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The following is a letter which I received from James J. Brady, president of the student government at Southeastern:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: On behalf of the student body of Southeastern Louisiana College, I am forwarding to you a copy of the resolution supporting our President's and Government's position in Vietnam.

As you can see this resolution is accompanied by a list of over 1,300 names of students on our campus who support this posi-These names were collected by various members of the student body at different places on the campus.

This petition is not the neatest nor the most attractive that might be composed, but the sincerity of the students whose names appear on this roll reflect the true greatness of our republic.

I, therefore, ask that you make known our position concerning Vietnam to the President and to the other members of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES J. BRADY, President, Student Government.

And finally I include the letter which I sent to the President along with the resolution:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with great pride that I forward to you a petition signed by 1,300 students of Southeastern Louisiana College, located in my hometown of Hammond, La., expressing the support of these young people for our Nation's policy in Vietnam.

The letter transmitting this petition, from Student Government President James J. Brady, reflects the hope of our country through the courageous attitude of this student body.

I am very pleased and happy to submit this petition to you.

With kindest regards, I am, Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON, Member of Congress.

John F. Kennedy Junior High Dedicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure and privilege to deliver the Dedication Day address on February 20. 1966, for the John F. Kennedy Junior High School, Randolph, Mass.

I would like to especially commend Mrs. David Good, for her excellent portrait of our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy. Mrs. Good's art career began and continued through her high school years at the Academy of the Assumption. She received her B.S. in art education in 1962, having attended the Massachusetts College of Art and has devoted much of her time to substitute teaching in the Randolph High School, attending painting courses and serving on art juries in local contests.

Mr. and Mrs. Good, both natives of Randolph, and their five children reside at 535 South Main Street, Randolph. An exhibition of Mrs. Good's paintings will be on display during March at the Brockton Public Library, Brockton, Mass.

Following is an account of the ceremonies, which appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger, of February 21, 1966, along with the text of my address and the dedication program.

[From the Quincy Mass.) Patriot Ledger, Feb. 21, 1966]

FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTY ATTEND CEREMONIES: JOHN F. KENNEDY JUNIOR HIGH DEDICATED

RANDOLPH .- The new John F. Kennedy Junior High School was dedicated yesterday in ceremonies highlighted by tributes to the late President's interest in education and concern for the country's youth.

LATE PRESIDENT PRAISED

Senator James R. McIntyre, mayor of Quincy, and U.S. Representative James A. BURKE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, both praised the late President and spoke on his interest in education.

Congressman BURKE said Kennedy's vigor appealed to the youth of America and, in turn, youth had a "manifold responsibility to a past Congressman, Senator, and President."

Senator McIntyre was introduced by Raymond P. McGerrigle, school committeeman and chairman of the dedication committee.

More than 550 persons attended the ceremonies.

A portrait of President Kennedy was presented to the school by Mrs. David Good. The portrait will be hung in the school's library. A new American flag was also given to James L. Topham, Kennedy School principal, by

Mrs. Dorothy Tolson, president of the Amvets Post Auxiliary.

OTHER SPEAKERS

Others speaking at the dedication included Dr. John Collins, headmaster at Newman Preparatory School, Boston; Norman Silk, chairman of the Randolph selectmen, and William J. Doherty, chairman of the school planning and building committee.

Participating in the ceremonies were the color guard of the Randolph Veterans' Council, the Kennedy Junior High School Band, under the direction of Leonard Rapoza; Deborah Christian, Paul Maloof, Edward Tedesco, architect; Rev. J. Sidney Kearns, pastor of St. Mary's School; Charles Green, school committeeman; Richard Coburn, finance committee chairman, and Rev. Arthur Bowler, minister of the First Congregational Church.

Prior to the ceremonies, the school was open for inspection by residents. The split-level building houses 28 regular classrooms, 11 specialized classrooms, a cafetorium with stage and kitchen, library, gymnasium, guid-ance rooms, and a teachers' room. The outdoor site encompasses a football field, baseball diamond, tennis courts, and areas for physical education.

DEDICATION: JOHN F. KENNEDY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, RANDOLPH, MASS., FEBRUARY 20, 1966, 3:30 Р.М.

PROGRAM

Flag raising, color guard: veterans council—American Legion, DAV, VFW, AMVETS.

Invocation: Rev. Father John S. Kearns. "The Star-Spangled Banner": John F. Kennedy Junior High School Band, Leonard Rapoza, director of music.

Salute and Pledge of Allegiance: Deborah Christian, Paul Maloof.

Greetings and introduction of guests: Raymond P. McGerrigle, chairman.

Presentation of keys-Acceptance: Mr. Edward Tedesco to Mr. William J. Doherty and Mr. Charles Green.

Presentation of portrait of President John F. Kennedy: Mrs. David Good.

Acceptance of portrait: Mr. Peter J. Davin, chairman, school committee.

Acceptance of American flag: Mr. James L. Topham, principal.

Introduction of speaker: Thomas L. War-ren, superintendent of schools.

Remarks: Hon. James A. Burke, Congress-man, 11th Massachusetts District.

Benediction: Rev. Arthur Bowler. March-Military escort: Bennett, John F. Kennedy Junior High School Band.

DEDICATION COMMITTEE

Raymond P. McGerrigle, chairman; William J. Doherty, Daniel Hayes, Thomas L. Warren, William J. Lynch, Henry Lesser.

PLANNING

The school planning and building committee and the school committee presented to the town meeting members on March 4, 1963, the proposal to build a new junior high school in the center of Randolph.

This special town meeting of March 4, 1963, authorized the school planning and building committee and the school committee to apply for Federal funds under Public Law 560 of the 83d Congress for the purchasing of preliminary and final plans for a new junior high school.

This procedure was followed, and the town was able to borrow, interest free, the sum

of \$68,371 for architects' fees. The economical, yet educationally func-tional building, is the result of many, many hours of thoughtful planning by the members of the school planning and building comittee, the school committee, and the administrators. It was opened for classes on Monday, November 22, 1965, coincidentally on the second anniversary of the assassination of the President.

FACILITIES

An egress walkway to the southeast from the school property to Alfred Terrace was constructed together with a steel fence along the entire east boundary to protect the property of homeowners.

Studies are now being made into the possibility of providing a second egress road

to alleviate the traffic congestion.

A permanent sewer system was made from the school to the trunkline on Pleasant Street through an egress obtained through

the Lind property.

The split level building, designed to follow the natural contours of the site contains the following: 28 regular classrooms, 11 specialized classrooms, shops or laboratories, a cafetorium with stage and kitchen, a library, a gymnasium, guidance rooms, and a teachers' room. Maintenance-free materials have been used and, wherever necessary, acoustic materials have been amply provided. A variety of color has been used throughout in order to provide a pleasant atmosphere for work.

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL PLANNING AND BUILDING COMMITTEE

Chairman: William J. Doherty; secretary, James J. Tantillo: George Beatty, John A. Dellea, Daniel Hayes, Kenneth J. Bradbury, Eugene Solon, Henry Lesser, Walter Winston, Harvey Teed, Raymond P. McGerrigle.

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Chairman, Peter J. Davin; secretary, Mrs. Marie Helm Cormey; Charles E. Green, Jr., Mrs. Patricia M. McDermott; Raymond P. McGerrigle.

Architect: Edward J. Tedesco Associates,

General contractor: Tocci Bros. Construc-

tion Co., Inc. Clerk of the works: Bruce Dunbar.

Principal: John F. Kennedy Junior High School, Mr. James L. Topham.

Dedication committee: Raymond P. McGerrigle, chairman; William J. Doherty, Thomas L. Warren, Henry Lesser, William J. Lynch, Daniel Hayes.

EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANTS

Thomas L. Warren, superintendent of schools; William J. Lynch, assistant superintendent of schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The school planning and building committee wishes to express its thanks to the town meeting members, the board of selectmen, the school committee, and the superintendent of schools and the assistant superintendent of schools—and gratefully acknowledges its appreciation to all who have so generously contributed assistance.

The Randolph school committee wishes in the name of the school system personnel and the pupils to thank the townspeople and the members of the school building and planning committee for their cooperative efforts in providing this excellent and muchneeded school building.

"Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."—John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States—1961-63.

The sculptor: Bert Kilgore, the sculptor who executed the bas relief of John F. Ken-

The sculptor: Bert Kilgore, the sculptor who executed the bas relief of John F. Kennedy for Edward Tedesco Associates, is a native of Wakefield, Mass., and presently resides in Woburn. Although he has worked in various parts of the country, most of his sculpture has been for New England architects.

Mr. Kilgore received his formal art training in the School of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston. His works are to be found in many parts of New England.

His sculpture is architectural and he considers the portrait at the John F. Kennedy Junior High School to be an ideal example of collaboration between the arts of archi-

tecture and sculpture. The depth of the carving and recession of the marble panels into the brick wall indicate that this work was not an afterthought on the part of the architect, but rather a preconceived idea carried through to completion.

PORTRAIT OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mrs. David Good, painter and donor of the excellent portrait of our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy, is a resident of Randolph, and graduate of the Massachusetts College of Art.

Her painting of the late President has been called one of the finest for the way in which it has caught the firmness, yet the youth, humor, and courage of the man.

SITE

The site of the school is most ideal, being centrally located on a sloping eminence over-looking to the north, the St. Mary's Parochial School complex and to the east, the town of Holbrook.

Access to the school is from Mill Street with a road named in honor of Mr. William Hurley, a veteran of World War I and a long-time resident of the immediate area.

The 16-acre site was purchased by the town of Randolph from Mr. Lind for \$43,600 and has been extensively landscaped with a football field, baseball diamond, tennis courts, and areas for physical education.

STATISTICS

Acreage: 16.87 acres.
Building area, 86,910 square feet.
Student capacity: 1,000 students.
Parking capacity: 185 cars.
Building cost per square foot: \$15.60.

Expenditures:

Expenditures.	
General contract including site development	\$1,560,400
Planning and supervision	112, 320
Clerk of the works	12, 450
Furnishings and equipment	133, 123
Miscellaneous	14, 301
Unexpended	4, 406
And the second s	AVERSON STREET

Total appropriation____ 1,837,000

State: 50 percent.

DEDICATION AT RANDOLPH JOHN F. KENNEDY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL BY HON. JAMES A.

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, faculty members, and friends, I am delighted to have been invited to speak at the dedication of this beautiful junior high school, named in memory of our late and beloved President John F. Kennedy. This dedication ceremony has particular significance to me because had the honor of serving in the U.S. Congress under his direction as President. John F. Kennedy always had an intense interest in education. As a Congressman from Massachusetts, in one of his early educational pro-posals, John Kennedy said: "I am aware that Massachusetts is not an island unto itself, and its progress, its peace, its prosperity, and ultimately its survival depend upon the wisdom and enlightenment of the public school graduates in every part of the country." Let us not forget that much of the educational legislation passed during the last session of Congress was originally initiated by John F. Kennedy.

His youthful vigor appealed greatly to the younger generation and they immediately began to identify themselves with the President. President Kennedy encouraged their confidence by choosing the youth of America to represent our country abroad under the auspices of the Peace Corps. He realized that the future of our country was in their hands and emphasized to American youth the importance of staying in school and completing their education. We, of Massachusetts can be justly proud of our schools and the remembrance that one of our native

sons was elected to Congress, went on to become a great Senator, and a dearly beloved President of the United States. These attainments should be emphasized to the students of John F. Kennedy Junior High School, since they too can become the future leaders of America. John F. Kennedy was so proud to be the President of a democratic society because he believed that only in a democracy did the future leadership depend so much on educational preparation.

Our Government has made education free and available to every American, beginning with the elementary school and continuing through high school. Junior high school is an important transition, the transition to greater maturity and learning. It is with the introduction of junior high school that the student begins to sort out his knowledge and attains a greater proficiency in subject matter.

Those of you who will be studying and teaching at this beautiful John F. Kennedy Junior High School have a manifold responsibility, a responsibility to a past Congressman, Senator, President, and educator. It is up to all of you not to allow specialization of subject matter to consume the student as well as the teacher. Having broad interests is most important in keeping our democratic way of life alive.

Unfortunately, President Kennedy did not live to see many of his educational ideals enacted into legislation, but let all of us here cherish his name and be inspired by his educational beliefs. In a message to Congress, President Kennedy referred to education as a "keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." Today, let us remember the name of John F. Kennedy as a keystone in the structure of this school. I know that I share with all of you the hope that this school will endure and flourish with all of the beauty and greatness inherent in its fine name.

Estonian People Remembered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, each year on the appropriate days, Members of this Chamber join their fellow Americans throughout the world in remembering that millions of persons in countries behind the Iron Curtain live their daily lives subjected to Soviet imperialism. It is well that we vocally remember, thereby keeping alive even a faint hope that someday the captive nations of Europe may join the international community as free and independent members of the family of nations.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to the greatness of the Estonian people, and to recall that 48 years ago these proud people declared themselves independent. They then reestablished their national independence which they had lost in the course of imperialist Russian expansion to the west. But the Estonian people were able to enjoy their freedom for merely two decades. The new masters of Russia—the Communists—with their Red army—overran and occupied the country during World War II. That these traditionally free people are not free today is one of the great tragedies of our times.

Since World War II began, approximately 55 former colonies representing about 1.5 billion people have gained their independence, these peoples constituting about one-third of those living today, are free. In many more cases, western colonial powers helped and nurtured their colonies toward responsible independence. What we in the West and most of the newly independent countries fail to realize is that during this same period of time, not a single colony of the Soviet Union has become an independent state. In fact, the Soviets have expanded their empire where they have been able, and have brutally repressed those under their yoke who have sought to attain their freedom.

Yet it is the Soviets, employing the Marxist dialectic, who have branded the Western nations as the colonial powers, when in fact, Mr. Speaker, behind the Iron Curtain lies the largest colonial empire the world has ever seen and suffered with. We ought to recognize the spurious Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for exactly what it is: a colonial empire which makes a mockery of sovereignty, freedom, human justice, and social conditions.

We shall not let ourselves be fooled by the Russian propaganda agencies. Life in this "worker's paradise" is difficult, as the Estonians watch their wherewithal being shipped out of their country; as they watch their women and children being forced to work hard and long hours and days for no apparent increase in the nation's standard of living; as they crave the amenities of life, especially clothing, only to be told, haps next year"; as the majority of Es-tonians outside the major cities live in substandard housing, many of these units having only outside plumbing; as wages rarely rise, and almost never faster than the cost of living. It is a sorry life, but it should not surprise us to see this. The millions of people in the captive nations learned a long time ago that the true nature of Russian socialism is somewhat less than colonial poverty.

We are not deceived. We shall not forget. The Estonian people have our faith, our trust, and the everlasting hope for a brighter tomorrow.

From Cracker Barrel to Computer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit, for inclusion in the Record, a speech presented by our distinguished colleague, Congresswoman Catherine May, at the International Consumer Credit Association Conference on February 20, 1966, at Sacramento, Calif.

Congresswoman May's speech, entitled "From Cracker Barrel to Computer," presents a timely and informative discussion

of the consumer in America today at the food market.

She points out that modern packaging and marketing have resulted in largescale gains to the consumer in improved products and lower costs, and that the vast majority of those in the industry are conscientiously and sincerely trying to do the best job possible in serving the public.

I invite attention to Congresswoman May's speech. She does an excellent job of "setting the record straight":

FROM CRACKER BARREL TO COMPUTER

(Address of Congresswoman Catherine May, International Consumer Credit Association, 29th Conference, Credit Women's Breakfast Club, Sunday, February 20, 1966, Sacramento, Calif.)

First of all, may I say thank you for this opportunity to participate in the International Consumer Credit Conference. You in your profession have been vorking with the consumer for many years. So, we have something in common. I was in Congress when the Government discovered the consumer. This was a fascinating experience, especially for a housewife who had been naively assuming that I had been around all the time. Today, however, I can proudly announce to you without fear of contradiction that Mr. and Mrs. Consumer of America have the Government seal of approval and are now officially in existence.

At this point, may I say that my attempts at levity in these opening remarks are only partly serious. I realize that many people view the consumer movement today with both cynicism and suspicion. This is cer-tainly not to be wondered at because so many self-appointed spokesmen for consumers just don't seem to know what they are talking about and so many self-appointed protectors of the consumer have proposed a number of very impractical-even improbable-legislative solutions. But, nevertheless, the consumer movement gains its impetus and popularity because of a vacuum in consumer information-because the abundance of our age has quite honestly brought bewilderment and confusion to the men and women who shop our fabulous modern-day stores. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the food industry. So, this morning I'm going to talk about the consumer and her grocery store.

The National Commission on Food Marketwas created by Congress in 1964 the purpose of making an 18-month study of our entire food marketing structure. I am a member of this Commission and I have found that one of the most absorbing aspects of the study has been in the area of the tremendous changes that have come about in the way we get food from farm to dinner table as compared to 20 years ago. A little recognized but very important fact is that one day back in 1953 the United States became the first country in the history of the world to develop to the point at which a larger percentage of its work force was engaged in the tasks of distributing goods and performing services than were engaged in the tasks of producing goods. Modern home economists point out that their jobs have changed because the home has ceased to be production unit and has become instead a consumption unit. What is true for the American home today is also true of the American economy. In the sense of the employment of most of our population, we are consuming and a marketing Nation, not a producing Nation and there is a very big difference, which is dramatically illustrated in what has happened to our food industry. In a few short years we have come to the place where only 8 percent of our popula-tion is engaged in producing food—and fewer than 10 percent of all the farms in America account for fully half of total American farm sales. In this same span of time, we have seen the disappearance of corner grocery stores—known as the "Ma and Pa" stores—as they are being replaced by the huge one-stop convenience shopping centers. Change in this field is still occurring rapidly and we have no idea yet what the future will bring.

Come to think of it, maybe we do have some idea and I'm not sure that the prospect is so pleasant if it goes this far. I read the other day about a new supermarket in West Germany which has become fully automated. Everything is displayed behind glass. The customer presses a button when she comes in the store. This button turns a turnstile and gives milady a shopping token. She wanders through the aisles looking at the various displays. When she sees something that strikes her fancy as a good idea for the family dinner, she drops the token into the vending machine, punches a button and the machine delivers the product while marking the price on the token. When all her various food items have been chosen, she drops the token into a payment slot and receives her bill. She then puts her money into another machine and it delivers her change. The owners pointed out that this automated type of shopping protected the little woman from 'temperamental clerks, coupons, salesmanship, and shoplifting temptations." Columnist Phyllis Battelle made a whimsical comment on this store in one of her columns the other day when she said, "drop your token in the slot and don't be surprised if you hear, 'I'm sorry; the calf's liver you have dialed is not a working liver—please dial a pork roast."

Well, however little the prospect of this type of progress may please—in food shopping we have come from cracker barrel to computer. And, in the process, the great public issue called consumerism has had a meteoric career.

I think most of us thought we were pretty well off until our protectors began to tell us that our supermarkets are jungles and our department stores usurers. Now people are lining up to get the chance to protect us from all this—and from ourselves. For a number of reasons that I will spell out in some detail here today, I'm beginning to believe that we may need protection from them.

This is not to say that these self-appointed consumer spokesmen are not sincere and nobly motivated. Yet I think that in their zeal to protect us all in the marketplace, they have failed to grasp a number of fundamental truths about the way in which our economy works, and about the nature of poverty, which many of their actions are said to alleviate.

Turning to the marketplace first, it seems to me that my protectors have failed to recognize either the motivations or limitations on businessmen in a consumer-driven society.

Businessmen are not, we should all understand, either better or worse, or more honest or less so, than any other group of human beings. The vast majority are simply trying to do an honest job for their companies, and to earn a profit by performing a service for which a number of people will pay. There are, of course, some quick-buck operators who profit by deceit. There always will be. But most are not dishonest, and much of the appeal of the so-called consumer spokesmen is based on the misconception that most businessmen are cheats.

By the same token, these critics of business have, I believe, badly underestimated the practical, existing legal, and competitive limitations on the ability of a businessman seeking long-term growth for his company to do so through deception.

It should be pointed out for the record that our Nation today is not without laws designed to protect consumers in the marketplace. The Federal Government is involved in 296 programs to help the consumer—118 of these activities directly protect and advance consumer interest. Costs of these programs total over \$100 million a year and employ over 7,000 Federal workers full time.

Just as an example, the Federal Trade Commission, after testifying in support of a new packaging and labeling legislation because, according to its Chairman, it was powerless to act in the field, found only a couple of months ago that it has always had, after all, the power to stop cents-off labeling when its effect is misleading.

Important as these existing legal restraints are, however, of equal importance is the power of free choice in a competitive, consumeristic economy.

Most consumer goods industries today are highly competitive and individual items usually earn very small profits per unit of sale. I'm told that in the food industry, for example, it takes 3 years for a typical new product to earn enough money to pay off the initial investment and begin to generate a real profit.

This means that selling this item just once isn't going to get anyone anywhere.

Enough consumers must prefer it over alternatives and choose it regularly—not just once—in order for the manufacturer to get his money back. In other words, it's repeat business—not the one-shot sales—that pay off. And I am convinced by my own experiences as a shopper that businessmen try hard to earn this repeat business, and that those who do not earn it don't get it.

This protection, regulated by competition in the consumer interest, is the very heart of our free enterprise system. I think it's a good system, and one that works.

Yet it is precisely this system which the consumer spokesmen so distrust that they would substitute for it their own judgment about what it is that I, as a consumer, most want. I do not question their sincerity of purpose. I do question their ability to make my value judgments for me. And when faced with a choice between regulation by a system and regulation by men, I'll take the system. It's slow and cumbersome, in many cases, but it is not susceptible to whim or prejudice, and it works.

The second truth about the marketplace that our new consumer spokesmen have often failed to grasp—and this is the reason I'm afraid we may need protection from them—is that it is possible to get more consumer protection than we are willing to

pay for.

For another built-in protection we get from our system has resulted from the development of efficient, high-speed machinery and other cost-cutting manufacturing procedures designed to bring consumers the things they want at low unit costs. Since many of the self-styled improvements consumer spokesmen say they want me to have would arbitrarily overturn many of these economies, they would add to the cost of the merchandise I buy. This might give me more protection and certainty, but I question whether it's really worth it.

For example, mass production techniques require that packages be filled and weighed in bulk, rather than individually. This means that 100 1-pound packages of something will weigh 100 pounds, but each individual package may weigh slightly more or less. Actually, in practice, many manufacturers tell me that they purposely overfill their packages so that any errors will be more likely to occur by overfilling than by underfilling. One cereal manufacturer adds a pound of product to every 24 pounds, so that the total weight of a case of any of his products will actually weigh more than the total listed weight of the contents.

Most regulatory agencies have recognized that this mass weighing is an absolute necessity if we are to have the cost-cutting benefits of mass production. It is a compromise that I find easy to understand, but many consumer spokesmen have labeled it a form of economic cheating. In some cases, movements have been started to abolish the current systems of tolerances. I don't think it's worth the cost.

Another example has to do with the size of consumer packages and their net contents. Few consumer spokesmen seem to recognize the fact that the system I find doing so well, and they find so dangerous, has built a high degree of standardization in package size. Again, the reason businessmen have done so is to give their companies—and, because of competitive forces, the consumer—the full benefits of mass production.

Let me give you one classic example on this point. In an attempt to drum up support for Federal control for packaging and labeling one of our chief spokesmen for the consumer in Government refers to a survey she made some time ago. She sent a number of housewives out and asked them to choose from a supermarket the cheapest in terms of price per ounce—products in several categories. These ladies found a lot of trouble when it came to buying tunafish and now this is being used as an illustration of packaging fraud. I'll be the first to tell you that when you stop by the tunafish display in the average market you are going to have to make some decisions on selection because there are so many different kinds of packs of tuna. And the reason there are so many different kinds is because one is designed to one job and another, another. I buy one kind of tunafish for salad and another type if I am going to use it in a creamed dish. The tunafish packer knows that this is what I want in the way of selection. So, he packs tuna in whole pack and chunks, in oil, and in brine. But each of these different kinds of products is put in the same size can. Naturally, the weight between cans is going to vary because of the way they are packed. Whole tuna in oil, example, will have a different weight than chunk tuna in oil, even though they are both in the same size can. Why do manufacturers do this? Well, simply so that they can get maximum use out of their can making and can filling machinery and still offer variety to consumers. This makes for good consumer values. Yet, many of the consumer spokesmen cry that this causes confusion and that the weight should be standardized instead. And, they make no mention of the fact that this will add to costs. Again, I question whether this kind of protection is worth the price.

The main thing here is that there has been a sizable and regrettable misunderstanding in the minds of these very well-meaning people about what consumers actually want in terms of value. Most of the consumer movement today is involved in trying to push through legislative and administrative measures to assure that consumers can always find the thing that costs them least per ounce.

But speaking for myself—and, I believe, most other shoppers—I can assure them that, while price comparisons are important, they are only part of the way in which I judge value. Of far greater importance, it seems to me, is the intangible, subjective question of whether or not a product is going to satisfy myself and my family.

If we want bran flakes, for example, the fact that oatmeal may (or may not) be less expensive per pound doesn't really make any difference to me. The value really lies, in that case, in the more expensive product. And making it easier for me to make this—to me—essentially meaningless comparison isn't going to earn my appreciation, especially if doing so has raised the cost of both products.

But, the consumer spokesmen say, this is of vital importance to the poor, and should be done for them. Yet while it is unquestionably true that helping the poor get more for their money is a worthy enterprise, I sincerely question whether the mass of consumer protection ideas will really do the job.

I question this because I believe that the most common consumer protection measures are designed to solve essentially imaginary problems, ignore the real problems, and in any case, mistakenly assume that treating poverty's symptoms will somehow cure the disease.

It is a fact, I believe, that supermarket shopping today does present some problems. But the problems are not those of simple price comparisons. A more basic problem is the fact that businessmen's sheer inventiveness and ingenuity has spawned such a great variety of new and tempting products that how to best use them presents some very real shopping problems.

These are problems of abundance, not foisted off on an unsuspecting public, but offered us in an atmosphere of free choice. Many consumer spokesmen say this itself is a bad feature of the American marketplace and that the confusion this creates should be diminished by somehow restricting the number of new products that come on the market. How this would be done, I do not know. I am convinced that shoppers are more grateful to the businessmen who found they could package au gratin potatoes in convenient packages than they are to their spokesmen who, in the hysterical discovery of the obvious, complain that the packaged form is far more expensive than the ingredients

The real problem is not standardizing boxes or contents. The real problem is educating and training people to make the best use of the abundance that is available to them. And solving the problem begins with an effort directed at the people, rather than at the products.

The fact that a shopper can instantly recognize the lowest cost item available to her in a certain category is meaningless if she hasn't got enough money to buy the product in the first place. The fact that a buyer of something on credit can instantly recognize a high rate of interest is meaningless to him if he needs the product and can't get the credit at a lower interest rate.

Concerning credit, the pressure is building for passage of credit control bills.

You should know and be pleased that your California statute regulating credit and installment sales of goods and services, which I believe is known as the Unruh act, is looked up to nationally as a model law. In it, we see reasonable legislation that has met the needs of the consumer and industry exceptionally well. It has furnished to the consumer adequate information upon which to make a decision on choosing the businessman to whom he will offer his credit.

Likewise, conformity with the law has presented no problem to the seller who wishes to follow the precepts of good business. The proof of the Unruh act's sufficiency is in the fact that it has stood the acid test of years. Proposals to amend it—allegedly for greater protection of the consumer—have been rejected when the spotlight showed up the fuzzy thinking behind such proposals. These, in fact, were poorly concealed efforts to put a straitjacket on the granting of credit to service retailing's customers and to facilitate merchandising.

For many Americans, poverty is a very real and grinding truth. What can be done to mitigate it should and must be done. But careful listing of price comparisons or interest rates are of little help to someone who can't read or judge. And it seems to me that if anywhere near half the effort currently being expended in the name of consumer protection were spent instead on educational efforts aimed at helping make smart shoppers out of today's buyers, something far more valuable would be accomplished.

Supermarket people tell me that the real secret to wise buying in their stores involves simply building a shopping list around a set budget, and then sticking to the list when you get to the store. Additionally, a recent U.S. Department of Agriculture study shows that shopping a store's specials will allow a consumer to chop 16 percent a year off of her food expenditures.

My point is that manufacturers and retailers, competing for our patronage, offer us We will be best off as we best learn to turn these honest competitive efforts to our own advantage, turning the attributes of the system to our own use. Only this way can we get the protection we really need.

I think by now you have gotten the point that I do not believe that we should look at today's supermarkets as a vast wasteland. As consumers we should look with grateful eves on the supermarket as a bountiful. even though often confusing and bewildering, symbol of the inventiveness and ingenuity of the food industry and the abundance of the Nation's farms. In trying to make a balanced judgment of value, I ask myself, "Am I willing to pay the price of some confusion and doubt for the tremendous variety of wonderful food that is being brought to me and my dinner table in an ever-increasing palatable and convenient form?" My answer is, "Yes, sir," without qualification. I'm glad to pay the high price of seasonal and sharply reduced markets. And, as a working wife myself, I would be the last to suggest to 8 million women who divide their time between a home and a job that they can't have the convenient food forms that make their tasks less burden-And those are only a couple of the alternatives that would arise if some of the regulators of the marketplace had their way.

Instead, there is a very practical and possible way to reduce the price of confusion in choicemaking-not by turning the Nation's supermarkets into a stultifying panorama of bland similarity but rather edu-cating consumers to the point that they can best use the variety which is offered.

There is a great challenge here to many

persons in our country-to the food editors, to the home economists, to our schools and to our consumer education services at various levels of our government. Too few people are trying to help our consumers buy wisely in relation to their needs. One house-wife's "giant economy size" can easily be another housewife's waste. Consumer education should be oriented more to the buying and using of foods than to cooking. Formalized education in our schools has a tremendous challenge to keep pace with new products and services and changing methods or distribution. In only a few schools are they meeting this challenge. As one critic commented the other day, "Virtually all commented the other day, "Virtually all courses in the field are cup-and-teaspoon oriented while we live in a thaw-and-serve Yet, just last year, half the population of the United States became 25 years old or younger—40 percent of our popula-tion is under 20. Studies show that 80 percent of all teenage girls shop for their fami-

ly's food and spend one-fourth of the entire family food budget—97 percent of them help plan the meals and help cook them. This is a real challenge in consumer education starting at the teenage level.

And I would like to give the knuckles of industry a gentle rap in this connection. What are they doing in the field of consumer education? As one industry spokes-man admitted the other day, "We have, perhaps, become so interested in engineering change that we have neglected to tell anybody about the significance or implications of the changes in terms of the basics of shopping cart and kitchen economics, rather than dead statistics."

The whole point I am trying to make is that an educated consumer is a protected consumer. And a dynamic, changing, keenly competitive food industry makes a happy and fortunate consumer.

To quote myself from a speech made some time ago,

"All the Government officials and all the Government laws in the world are as nothing compared to the impact Mrs. America has on Mr. Manufacturer and on Mr. Storekeeper when she makes up her mind to buy one brand over another. And when she makes that decision, no power on earth can save the businessman or the producer of the product who made the mistake of displeasing her. She has done and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring and in regulating American business enterprise.

"And, to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more Government regulations and laws—I want to protect her freedom of choice."

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Franklin Paul Harris, minister, McKendree Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, as this historic body begins its session today, may each Member relate himself to Thee, for in the matter of minutes we shall be up with the sweep of today's immediate tasks and we may easily lose our sense of direction and mission. At the same time each one of us is committed and consumed by minute details. May each one of us have an objective sense of what we are doing and how we are doing it. May this objective view be Thy view. Give each one of us the power to let go clearly those things which impede or hinder the working of Thy will in each of our lives and in our work. May we individually have a sense of fulfillment as we keep spiritual goals before us.

Enkindle in each of us this morning a contagious and helpful spirit with those

with whom we work.

We thank you, Eternal Spirit, for this privilege of being a part of this great and historic body, of helping to make laws, and the obligation of keeping these laws. In the spirit of adventure and challenge of this day of unfinished tasks, give us at its close a feeling that we have done our best; and if we have had a thousand chances, this one thing we did in re-

sponse to our conscience: "We have done that which we think is right." In God's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 24, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DUR-ING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM-SATURDAY SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President. I have discussed with some persons, principally members of the press, my intention of holding a session on Saturday.

The reason for such a session would be simply to try to accommodate those who wish to make speeches. I do not anticipate any votes on Saturday, but I feel that Senators who are delaying a vote on this very vital measure by making speeches-which they have every right to make-should make them, and we should hear no more complaints that Senators cannot make speeches because they have not had the opportunity to prepare them, or their secretaries have not had the opportunity to type the speeches, or they have not had the opportunity to have mimeographed copies made for the press. If Senators wish to speak, they ought to speak.

I shall not press for a vote on Saturday if anyone wishes to insist that the Senate should not vote tomorrow; but if a Senator cares to offer an amendment that could be disposed of by a voice vote-which we do frequently; more